

***A Critical Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta - N.A.Jayawikrama***

A series of articles from the *Pali Buddhist Review*

*Vol.1.2, 1976, pp.75-90:*

Criteria for the Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta

The Sutta Nipāta: Its Title and Form

*Vol.1.3, 1976, pp.136-63:*

The Vaggas of the Sutta Nipāta

Asoka's Bhābru Edict

The Aṭṭhaka Vagga

Other References in Buddhist Sanskrit Works

The Chinese Arthapadam

Aṣṭaka Varga or Arthaka Varga?

Pārayāna Vagga

Its Antiquity

The Vatthu Gāthā

Uruga Vagga

Culla and Mahā Vaggas

*Vol.2.1, 1977, pp.14-41:*

The Uruga Sutta

The Khaggavisāṇa Sutta

The Muni Sutta

*Vol.2.2, 1977, pp.86-105:*

The Parābhava Sutta

The Vasala Sutta

The Mahāmaṅgala Sutta

The Metta Sutta

The Ratana Sutta

*Vol.2.3, 1977, pp.141-58:*

The Yakkha Ballads

Hemavata Sutta

Ālavaka and Sūciloma Suttas

The Yakkha-legend (Ālavaka)

External Evidence

The Pastoral Ballads

Dhaniya Sutta

Language and Syntax

Style

Metre

Doctrinal Developments

External Evidence

Kasibhāradvāja Sutta

## External Evidence

*Vol.3.1, 1978, pp.3-19:*

The Narrative Ballads

Pabbajjā Sutta

Padhāna Sutta

Nālaka Sutta

External Evidence

The Nālaka-dsicourse

*Vol.3.2, 1978, pp.45-64:*

Some Suttas from the Aṭṭhaga Vagga

Kāma Sutta

The Aṭṭhakas

Jarā Sutta

Māgandhiya Sutta

Pucchās from the Pārāyana Vagga

Ajitaṃānavaka-Pucchā

Linguistic and other Internal Evidence

The Other Pucchās

The Apadāna and Sixteen Māṇavas

Reference in other works

*Vol 3.3, 1978, pp.100-113:*

General Observations and Conclusions

Vedic and Dialectic Variations

Conclusions

Postscript



# A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUTTA NIPĀTA

N. A. Jayawickrama

(We are grateful to Prof. Jayawickrama for permission to serialise his doctoral thesis which was accepted by the University of London in 1947 under its full title of ‘A critical analysis of the Pali Sutta Nipāta illustrating its gradual growth’. It was subsequently serialised in the *Ceylon University Review*—1943-67—in its issues January 1948 to April 1951.)

## Abbreviations

- A—*Āṅguttara Nikāya* (PTS, 6 vols. 1885-1910, 1956-61)  
BSk—Buddhist Sanskrit  
DA—*Dīgha Nikāya* (PTS, 3 vols. 1889, 1903, 1910; 1967, 1967, 1960)  
H. O. S.—Harvard Oriental Series  
I.H.Q.—the *Indian Historical Quarterly* (Calcutta, 1925-63)  
M—*Majjhima Nikāya* (PTS, 4 vols. 1887-1925, 1960-74)  
Miln—*Milindapañha* (PTS, 1880, 1963)  
Pj—*Paramatthajotikā* II (= *Suttanipāta Commentary* II, PTS, 1917, 1966)  
Pug—*Puggalapaññatti* (PTS, 1883, 1972)  
Pv—*Petavatthu* (PTS, 1889)  
S—*Saṃyutta Nikāya* (PTS, 6 vols. 1884-1904; 1960-73)  
S.B.E.—Sacred Books of the East series  
Sn—*Suttanipāta* (PTS, 1913, 1965)  
SnA I—*Suttanipāta Commentary* I (PTS, 1916, 1966)  
Th. 1—*Theragāthā*; Th. 2—*Therīgāthā* (PTS, 1883, 1966)

## The Criteria for the Analysis of the Sutta Nipāta

### 1

The *Sutta Nipāta* contains older and younger material side by side. The *Aṭṭhaka* and the *Pārāyana Vaggas* preserve, on the whole, older compositions. Many suttas included in the other three *vaggas* too can be established, without doubt, to belong to an equally old, or perhaps older stratum.

It is our present task to investigate whether the compilation of the *Sutta Nipāta* (as a separate work) was done by gradual stages or was the work of a single editor. It is certain that at least its last two *vaggas* had a separate existence prior to their being incorporated in the *Sutta Nipāta*, for there are numerous references to them in Pali, Buddhist

Sanskrit and Chinese works, with no mention of the *Sutta Nipāta* at all. Parts of the rest of the *vaggas* too appear to have existed in separate groups, but the *Sutta Nipāta*, as it is preserved now, is a compilation of a comparatively later date. The lateness of the compilation has no bearing whatsoever on the date of its constituent *suttas*. Chalmers, in his translation of the *Sutta Nipāta* entitled, *Buddha's Teaching* in H.O.S. Vol., 37, p. xvi, remarks, "the ascertained stages of growth of a compiled 'book' by no means settle the relative date of composition of its contents, a question for solution of which internal evidence must be invoked, for what it is worth." The internal evidence which helps to establish the relative date of composition of the *suttas* is primarily linguistic, but this alone is not sufficient. A study of the contents of the *Sutta Nipāta* along with its metre and style, doctrinal developments, and social conditions depicted in them will greatly supplement whatever information linguistic evidence yields. Whenever external evidence is available in support of internal evidence more definite results can be achieved.

## 2

*Linguistic evidence* consists mainly of an analysis of words in their form and use, of tenses, of syntax and of vocabulary. As early as 1880 Fausböll (Translation to *Sutta Nipāta*, S. B. E. vol. X, pp. xi. ff.) has pointed out, "We not only find here what we meet with in other Pali poetry, the fuller Vedic forms of nouns and verbs in the plural...the shorter Vedic plural and the instrumental singular of nouns...Vedic infinitives,...contracted (or sometimes old) forms,...by the side of protracted forms, but also some unusual (sometimes old) forms and words...We also find tmesis as in the Vedas...Sometimes we meet with difficult and irregular constructions, and very condensed expressions." He also notes that the parts of the *Sutta Nipāta* containing these "irregularities" are much older than the *suttas* in which the language is fluent and the verses are melodious. This practically covers the whole field of linguistic evidence that can be gleaned in the *Sutta Nipāta*.

A comparison of the linguistic peculiarities of the various parts of the *Sutta Nipāta* with Vedic, the language of the *Brāhmaṇas*, Pali of the *gāthā*-literature, Canonical prose, and Classical Sanskrit helps in some degree to fix the relative dates of the *suttas*. It has been already stressed that the importance of linguistic data should not be over-estimated, for, these alone without other corroborative evidence are not of very great value. More definite conclusions can be drawn when they are supported by other internal and external evidence.



*Other internal evidence* consists of metre and style, doctrinal developments and ideology, and social conditions. As a rule, *metre* is no proper criterion of judgment in assigning relative dates to Pali poetry. The majority of the metres employed in Pali is to be met with in earlier literature both Vedic and early Sanskrit. The developments and modifications that earlier existing metres have undergone in Pali may lead to some valuable information; but such changes invariably have their parallels in earlier Sanskrit literature. This minimises the importance of any evidence from this source. The changes in metre from which somewhat definite inferences could be drawn are to be met with only in very late Pali poetry; e.g., the Ceylon Chronicles.

The most popular metre in the *Sutta Nipāta* is *Anuṣṭubh Śloka*. There are no less than 562 stanzas in *anuṣṭubh* metre, in addition to 54 modified *anuṣṭubh ślokas* in the *Vatthu-gāthā* of the *Pārāyana*, making a total of 616 stanzas. (*Vide* Helmer Smith: "Metres of Sutta Nipāta". *Pj.* II. 3, pp. 637-644). Next comes *triṣṭubh* metre, which is employed in 374 stanzas. There are also 29 stanzas in *āryā* metre, and 117 in *vaitālīya* and its allied metres, *aupacchandasika* and *vegavatī*. Of these 117 stanzas only 15 are in pure *vaitālīya*, 41 are in *aupacchandasika*, 16 in *vegavatī* and the other 45 in mixed *vaitālīya*.

Chalmers, (*ibid*, p. xvii) maintains that *anuṣṭubh* is later than *triṣṭubh* and quotes the example of the four *Aṭṭhakas* in *triṣṭubh* metre preceded by the *Kāma Sutta* in *anuṣṭubh śloka*, stating that it "manifestly forms a late preface to the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* as a re-edited whole." He notes the change of metre in *Sāriputta Sutta* and remarks that "the equally edifying *ślokas* Nos. 955-62 suggest an editorial preamble to the vigorous *triṣṭubhs* with which the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* ends." He refers to the only *Triṣṭubh* verse in *Dvayatānupassanā Sutta* (Sn. 728), and the *triṣṭubhs* that are freely distributed in the *Pārāyana* as being much older than the rest of the stanzas in those sections which he calls "scholastic accretions." He advances another hypothesis that "the longer the metrical line the later is the composition likely to have been." (*ibid*).

Keith (*A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 417), too, believes that the longer metrical line is a later development in Classical Sanskrit. Thus, it may be possible, purely on theoretical grounds, that those verses

of the *Sutta Nipāta* in *āryā*, *vaitālīya*, *aupacchandasika*, *vegavatī* and mixed *vaitālīya* metres belong to a later stage of composition. Yet, there is no reason to assume that all the stanzas in the historically earlier *triṣṭubh* and *anuṣṭubh* metres are anterior to those written in later metres.

Unlike other metres *āryā* and *vaitālīya* are measured by the number of morae. (*Vide* Macdonell, *A Vedic Grammar for Students*, p. 436 n. 2). These metres in which the sum-total of morae was absolutely fixed probably developed from popular poetry according to Keith (*op. cit.* p. 418) and belong to the Classical epoch. Thus, Chalmers' hypothesis is generally applicable to the verses of the *Sutta Nipāta* though he is not quite correct in the application of his hypothesis to *triṣṭubh* and *anuṣṭubh* metres.

Both *triṣṭubh* and *anuṣṭubh* metres can be traced back to Vedic. About 40 per cent. of the stanzas in the *Rgveda* are written in *triṣṭubh*, whereas *anuṣṭubh* constitutes only about 8 to 9 per cent. (*Vide* Macdonell, *op. cit.* pp. 438 ff.). Though the former is very popular in the *Rgveda* the latter is the most predominant metre in the post-Vedic period (Macdonell, *ibid*). Thus, generally *anuṣṭubh śloka*s in the *Sutta Nipāta* may be expected to be later than the *triṣṭubh* verses. Here, the hypothesis regarding the length of the metrical line is inapplicable, as *triṣṭubh* which is considered older has a longer metrical line (4 X 11) than *anuṣṭubh* (4 X 8). Moreover, over 86 per cent. of the stanzas in the *Sutta Nipāta* are written in these two metres, and the number of stanzas written in other metres is just under 14 per cent. This being the case, Chalmers' suggestion, however true it may be, is of no great practical importance.

The historical order of these metres occurring in the *Sutta Nipāta* would be 1. *triṣṭubh* and *anuṣṭubh*, 2. *āryā*, *vaitālīya*, *aupacchandasika*, *vegavatī* and mixed *vaitālīya*. There is no guarantee whatsoever that stanzas written in older metres are necessarily earlier than those in later metres. Therefore, metre by itself is no sound criterion for fixing relative dates, and it only forms a very useful source of confirmatory evidence.

## 5

Style like metre, is closely allied to linguistic evidence. As the *Sutta Nipāta* is not a homogeneous work, its style varies in its different sections. Its poems range from simple popular ballads like the *Dhaniya* and *Kasibhāradvāja Suttas* to scholastic compositions like the *Dvayatānupassanā Sutta*. It also contains simple narratives like the *Pabbajjā* and *Padhāna Suttas* or the *Vatthu-gāthā* of the *Nālaka Sutta* and *Pārāyana Vagga* as well as dialogue-ballads of various types, besides didactic poems like the *Kiṃsīla* or *Dhammacariya Suttas* in which the editorial



hand is keenly felt.<sup>1</sup> A simple and easy style unhampered by poetic embellishments, excessive rhythm and metrical perfection suggests an early composition rather than a later one. The use of excessive alliteration, assonance, and *śleṣa* (word-play) and all such accompaniments of a 'heavy style' is generally a sign of lateness. The use of such poetical devices is greatly limited in the sections of the *Sutta Nipāta*, which from other evidence can be classed as very early.

The oft recurring refrain belongs to the field of popular poetry of all periods. It is also probable that the ballads in which the dialogue element predominates (e.g., *suttas* like the *Dhaniya* and *Hemavata*; and not the quasi-dialogue ballads in which an interlocutor asks a question and the Buddha is seen replying with a long uninterrupted discourse), were dramatised and became widely popular. These two facts do not lead to any clue regarding the relative dates of poems, but it could be noticed that style goes hand in hand with metre to support linguistic data, and that it is very useful as a criterion for fixing relative dates for these ballads.

The form in which these *suttas* are found (viz., entirely in verse, or mixed verse and prose, etc.) is sometimes helpful as a criterion.

## 6

*Doctrinal developments*, generally, are a good index to the time of composition of individual sections, rather than of a work as a whole. This is true of the majority of the works of the Pali Canon, as they contain material drawn from more than one stratum. No well-defined *developments* as such are to be noticed in the older ballads of the *Sutta Nipāta*, but a gradual change can be marked in the later ones. Some fundamental concepts already found in the earlier ballads and other early literature are seen undergoing a gradual crystallisation in the later ballads. New ideas are also seen finding their way. One such instance is the concept of *vāṣana* (which will be discussed later on).

## 7

Closely connected with doctrinal developments is *the growth of ideas*. In as much as the doctrinal emphasis lay on the earliest tenets of

1. There are at least 6 *suttas* (viz. the *Hiri*-, *Dhammacariya*-, *Kimśīla*-, *Uṭṭhāna*-, *Subhāsita*-, and *Attadaṇḍa*) which derive their names from their opening words. The *suttas* that are named after a word or simile in the body of the text are more numerous. There are 11 *suttas* (viz. the *Ālavaka*-, *Muni*-, *Hiri*-, *Kimśīla*-, *Rāhula*-,—the *Vathu-gāthā* are in irregular *anuṣṭubh*—*Subhāsita*-, *Kokāliya*-, *Vathu-gāthā* of *Nālaka*-, *Dhotaka pucchā* *Todeyya pucchā*, and *Jatukaṇṇi pucchā*) in which the opening lines are written in a different metre from that (or those) of the rest of the poem. In five of these the opening stanza (or stanzas) is in *anuṣṭubh*. Less numerous are the poems in which the concluding stanzas are written in a metre different from that of the rest of the poem: e. g. the *Dhaniya*-, *Sabhiya*-, *Vaṅṅisa*-, *Sundarikabhāradvāja* and *Pasūra Suttas*.

Buddhism—which Mrs. Rhys Davids prefers to call “*Sākya*”—in the majority of these ballads, so also could be noticed the gradual formation of definite ideas and concepts which in course of time came to play an important role in later Buddhism. Along with this appear standard technical expressions which too in course of time became fixed. Some terms are seen in the transitional stage of being crystallised in these ballads. The later ballads mark the gradual drift from primitive “*Sākya*” to monastic Buddhism which replaced it. The trend of development, if successfully traced, will enable one to place these *suttas* in some sort of chronological arrangement.

## 8

*Social conditions* depicted in the *Sutta Nipāta* reflect an age when Brahmanism held sway and caste exerted great influence. The ballads show that in spite of the effort of the Buddha to break down these barriers he was obliged to give new values to what was best in Brahmanism; (e.g., the Buddhist connotation of *brāhmaṇa*, etc.), in order to make his message universally acceptable. Society was mainly agricultural and there lived rich herdsmen like Dhaniya (a *Vaiśya*?) and brahmin farmers like Bhāradvāja. The *samaṇas* and *paribbājakas* are accepted institutions and many *paribbājakas* are represented as getting their individual problems solved by the Buddha.

The older ballads reflect a time when Buddhism had not developed into a full-fledged monastic (coenobitic) system. It is the *muni*, the *bhikkhu*, or the *samaṇa*, that these ballads are concerned with. There are only two references to *thera* in the whole of the *Sutta Nipāta*, both occurring in introductory prose at pp. 59 and 92 respectively. The latter reference is not to Buddhist *theras*, but to those who are “firmly established in their own religious beliefs.” The conditions among the *bhikkhus* were most probably far different from those prevalent during the time of the composition of the *Thera*-and *Therī-gāthās*. There appears no organised monastic body; but on the contrary there were the *munayo* (ascetics in general) or the *bhikkhus* who were expected to lead the life of a *muni*.

The social conditions reflected in the *Sutta Nipāta* regarding peoples and castes, countries and towns, brahmins and sacrifice are no different from those reflected in the prose *Nikāyas*. It is probable that the majority of the Pali works generally depict conditions prevalent at the time of their composition, but the difference of a century or two hardly makes any fundamental difference in the structure of society and mode of life in those far-off days.



Incidental references to contemporary history would enable one to draw some conclusions regarding the time of composition. Often such references are not made directly. They occur as anachronisms. One such instance is to be noticed in *mandira*—a political division; which probably came into being after the formation of a large empire. Thus, any evidence gathered from this source too will be seen to supplement what has already come to light from other sources.

9

*External evidence* is of utmost importance. Several Canonical works make reference to, and quote from certain suttas and sections in the *Sutta Nipāta*. This necessarily proves that the sections of these works which refer to and quote from the *Sutta Nipāta* are decidedly later than those respective *suttas* of the *Sutta Nipāta*. The references made to the *Aṭṭhaka* and the *Pārāyana Vaggas* will be discussed later. Equally numerous are the references made to these sections in the later BSk. and Chinese Buddhist literature. The *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* occurs in full in Chinese (i.e., No. 198 *Thai Shu Tripiṭaka*). Besides these references in literature there is important inscriptional evidence in Asoka's Bhābra edict. All these external data are connected with individual suttas and there is no specific mention of the *Sutta Nipāta* in any early work. It is mentioned for the first time in the *Milinda Pañha*.

10

Another criterion is the *indirect evidence* from the position of the *suttas* as they occur in the *vaggas*. Some *suttas* are placed at the head of the *vagga* for their outstanding merit (e.g., the opening *suttas* of the *Uraga Vagga*) while other opening *suttas* bear definite signs of lateness (e.g., *Ratana*). Of equal importance are the *suttas* occurring at the end of the *vagga*. The *Muni Sutta*, in spite of its being an old piece is placed at the end of the *Uraga Vagga* after a relatively younger piece *Vijaya Sutta*. On the other hand, the late *Dvayatānupassanā Sutta* concludes the *Mahā Vagga*.

In the light of all these conflicting data it is not possible to formulate a working principle to be guided by. However, it will be seen that some of these *suttas* are younger in time and in general tone. When older *suttas* in similar positions are also taken into account these younger pieces point to a redaction of the *suttas* subsequent to an earlier collation rather than to their being interpolations.

A striking similarity is to be seen in the Vinaya. The popular tradition has been embodied in the opening chapters of the *Mahā Vagga*, while

page 82 is missing



page 83 is missing

*nikāya* it is comparatively late, and is much later than the other four *Nikāyas* (*vide* Winternitz, *op. cit.* Vol. II, pp. 77 ff.). The Sarvāstivādins speak of only the four earlier *Nikāyas* (which they call *Āgamas*), and the Theravādins themselves had reached no general agreement regarding the number of works in the *Khuddaka Nikāya*. Even at the present day in countries where Pali Buddhism prevails the number of books which should constitute this *nikāya* is not agreed upon.

## 14

The *Jātakas* which form the tenth book of the *Khuddaka Nikāya* in the Theravāda Canon are also considered as a separate *aṅga* (lit. limb, i.e. division) in the descriptive classification known as the *navāṅga-satthusāsana* (the Ninefold Dispensation of the Teacher) which occurs in many places in the Canon itself e.g. *M.* I, 130; *A.* II, 103, 178, III, 86 ff.; 177 ff., *Pug.* 43, *Miln.* 344 etc. Although this classification is necessarily old (*vide* E. J. Thomas: *Life of Buddha* p. 167, where he considers the division into *aṅgas* as earlier than that into *nikāyas*) it does not speak of any definite works, for, a *jātaka* may be included in a *sutta*, an *udāna* in a *veyyākaraṇa* etc. Like the *Udāna* and the *Itivuttaka*, the name *Jātaka* coincides with that of an actual work in existence. But there is nothing to say that by this *aṅga* was meant the present *Jātaka*. As Dr. E. J. Thomas (*History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 227) says “the probability is that the terms were used...to describe the character of the composition” rather than signify actual works. He points out that there are numerous instances of *udānas* and *jātakas* in various parts of the Canon which are not included in the works known by these respective names; (*ibid*) e.g., the *Mahāśudassana Sutta* in the *Dīgha Nikāya*, *jātakas* in *Cariyā Piṭaka*, *Sivi Jātaka* called *Sivi Sutta* in *Miln.*, etc. So is also the case with the *Itivuttaka*.

Taking up the division of the Pali *Navāṅga*, its first *aṅga*, *Sutta*, is said to include the Vinaya, certain *suttas* in *gāthā*, and other sayings of the Buddha classed as *sutta*. It is noteworthy that Commentaries considered these sections of the *Sutta Nipāta* which did not fall into the category of *sutta*, as *gāthā*, the fourth *aṅga* (*vide* *DA.* I, 23); but *gāthā* primarily consisted of verses in *Dh. Th.* 1 and *Th.* 2 (*vide* Thomas, *op. cit.*). The Commentary says that the *Sutta Nipāta* consists of *gāthā* (verse), *geyya* (mixed prose and verse) and *veyyākaraṇa* (expositions) which, on account of their informative, instructive and expository nature are called *suttas*, and that the work is called the *Sutta Nipāta* because it contains such *suttas* grouped together (*SnA.* 1—*Pj.* II introduction). From these statements it is clear that at least some *suttas*, if not the

majority of them in the *Sutta Nipāta*, can be said to belong to the *Sutta Aṅga* (vide Thomas, *op. cit.*).

Of the known instances of *nipātas* in the Pali Canon, the *Aṅguttara* as a work has nothing corresponding to it in the *Navanāga* division, the *Jātaka* may have been considered to correspond to the seventh *aṅga*, *Jātaka*, and it is probable that the *Sutta Nipāta* was only a *nipāta* of a similar *aṅga*. This only implies that the *Sutta Nipāta* consists of some *suttas* representative of the type *Sutta* and therefore is a *nipāta* of *suttas*.

15

This collection should consist entirely of pieces which could be designated as *Sutta* if the title *Sutta Nipāta* were to be justified. The Commentary (*SnA.*) states that the three types *gāthā*, *geyya* and *veyyākaraṇa* can be again called *sutta* and therefore the *gāthā* in the *Sutta Nipāta* are *suttas* as well. It is not possible to draw a line of demarcation between *gāthā* and *sutta*. Of the 72 pieces found in the *Sutta Nipāta* as many as 54 i.e. those forming *vaggas* I-IV, are called *sutta* by name, irrespective of whether they would strictly be categorised as *sutta* or *gāthā*, if such a division were possible. (The other 18 pieces form the *Pārāyana* consisting of the prologue—*vatthu-gāthā*, the 16 *pucchās* and the epilogue respectively). This fact probably furnishes a clue to this problem. During the time of the arrangement of this collection the distinction between *gāthā* and *sutta* may not have been strictly observed, and things may have existed in a rather fluid state.

In the first 54 pieces a growing tendency towards standardisation can be seen. Every piece, whether ballad or discourse, is termed a *sutta*. The stanzas of the so-called *suttas* are often referred to as *gāthā*; e.g. *Sn.* 429 ed,

*Imā gāthā bhaṇaṃ māro aṭṭhā Buddhassa santike*

(Uttering these stanzas Māra stood near the Buddha); *Sn.* 251c,

*citrāhi gāthāhi muni-ppakāsayi*

(the sage declared in colourful verse) in the narrative section of the *Āmagandha Sutta*; *Sn.* pp. 13, 32, 46 and 48 in the narrative prose of the *Kasibhāradvāja*, *Ālavaka*, *Mahāmaṅgala* and *Sūciloma Suttas* respectively,

*Atha kho...Bhagavantam gāthāya ajjhabhāsi.* (Then indeed, N. N. addressed the Bhagavā in a stanza); *Sn.* p, 78,

*Sāruppāhi gāthāhi abhitthavi* (extolled him with appropriate stanzas) in the prose of the *Subbhāsita Sutta*. It also occurs at *Sn.* 81=480 in the phrase, *gāthābhigīlaṃ* (what is obtained by reciting stanzas) and *Sn.* 1131 a, *pārāyanaṃ anugāyissaṃ* (I shall sing the *Pārāyana*).



Besides these there are three instances of introductory verses called *Vatthugāthā* viz. 1. A short introduction to the *Rāhula Sutta* (Sn. 335-336), 2. the introduction to the *Nālaka Sutta* (Sn. 679-698) and 3. the prologue to the *Pārāyana* (Sn. 976-1031).

Again in the Bhābru (or Bairat) Minor Rock Edict of Aśoka (*vide* Hultzsch: *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. 1, p. 172) the fourth *dharmapaliyāya* (section of the Scriptures) which is identified with the *Muni Sutta* of the *Sutta Nipāta* (*vide* Dharmānanda Kosambi: *Indian Antiquary* 1912 pp. 37 ff.) is called *Muni-gāthā* (Stanzas on a Sage). The sixth which is identified with the *Sāriputta Sutta* of the *Sutta Nipāta* (*ibid.*) is called *Upatisapasine* (the question of Upatissa). Here too is noticeable the tendency towards standardisation, for, what were known to Aśoka as *gāthā* and *pasine* are called *suttas* in the *Sutta Nipāta*. Thus, it can be seen that an attempt has been made to designate as *suttas*, as many pieces of the *Sutta Nipāta* as possible. Hence the compiler has found no difficulty in classifying this work as a *nipāta* in a larger group of *suttas*. It is very unlikely that he had the *Sutta Piṭaka* in mind, and it is quite probable that the *Sutta Nipāta* was meant to be a *nipāta* among *suttas* in general, if not in the *aṅga* of *Sutta*, although finally it came to be considered as a *nipāta* of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*.

## 16

### The Form of the Sutta Nipāta

The *suttas* of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* and the *Pucchās* of the *Pārāyana Vagga* are entirely in verse, whereas *suttas* of the other three *vaggas* are of two different types, one in pure verse, the other partly in verse and partly in prose. The 20 *suttas* in *vaggas* 1-111 which are entirely in *gāthā* form and called "Verse Ballads" (*vide*, S. M. Katre: *Early Buddhist Ballads and their Relation to Older Upanishadic Literature*) are distributed in the following manner: 7 in *Uruga Vagga*, 9 in *Culla Vagga* and 4 in *Mahā Vagga*. The "Mixed Ballads" (in prose and verse) occur as 5, 5 and 8 in the three respective *vaggas*. The absence of Mixed Ballads in the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana Vaggas* and the ascending order in which they occur in the other three *vaggas* may furnish valuable data in discussing the relative chronology of these *suttas*.

The prose in these *suttas* is not an essential factor in the dialogue or discourse as the case may be. It is employed as an aid to the narrative or to describe the *nidāna* (the context). The only prose in seven<sup>1</sup> of these eighteen Mixed Ballads is the passage describing the circumstances

1. *Parābhava*, *Ālavaka*, *Mahāmaṅgala*, *Sūciloma*, *Vaṅḡsa*, *Dhammika* and *Kokāliya*.

leading up to the dialogue or discourse in verse. Six *suttas*<sup>2</sup> contain an additional prose passage, following the verse, which is very similar to one another in five instances describing the confession of faith by the Buddha's interlocutors. The other five *suttas*<sup>3</sup> contain three or more prose passages many of them interspersed with the verses.

17

A close examination of the prose passages shows that they did not, as a rule, form an essential part of the ballad to begin with. In four of the last category of *suttas* i.e. except the *Dvayatānupassanā*, it serves merely as a connecting thread running through the whole ballad linking up the various parts. Generally, when what is stated in the stanzas is not sufficient for the listener to grasp what has transpired between the end of one part and the beginning of the next part of the ballad, prose is introduced giving the necessary details; e.g. *Sn.* p. 14,

*Atha Kho Kasibhāradvājo brāhmaṇo mahatīyā kaṃsapātiyā pāyāsaṃ vadḍhetvā Bhagavato upanāmesī* (Then the brahmin K. served out milk-rice in a large bronze bowl and offered it to the Bhagavā). Also see *Sn.* p. 110. Sometimes with the change of speaker prose is introduced; e.g. *Sn.* p. 79, in the *Subhāsita Sutta*; and often for both the above reasons; e.g. *Sn.* p. 111 *Sela* and pp. 94-100 *Sabhiya Suttas*.

The language of the prose is quite similar to that of the prose *Nikāyas* in idiom, syntax and style. The stereotyped expression in the prose of the *Sutta Nipāta* does not permit one to infer that it preserves the exact words of the narrators or reciters of these ballads. Generally, ballad-reciters state *in their own words*, such facts as are necessary for the listeners to follow the narrative in the ballads. Here the prose states the same facts though clothed in the standard Canonical garb; and probably this standardisation has taken place long after the composition of the ballads themselves.

Narrative prose should be compared with verse employed for narration, found in abundance in the *Sutta Nipāta*. The Commentator himself attributes several stanzas to the *saṅgītikārā* (reciters at a *Samigīti* or "Council", i.e., compilers); e.g. *Sn.* 30, 251-252, 355d, 401d, 429cd, 449 and the epilogue of the *Pārāyana* at (*SnA.* 42, 292, 351, 377, 387, 394 and 603 respectively). In addition to these he attributes to the *saṅgītikārā*, such repertory phrases as, *iti Bhagavā* (*Sn.* 355 etc.), *iti brāhmaṇo* (*Sn.* 459 etc.) and prose elements in the *Sabhiya*, *Sundarikabhāradvāja*, *Māgha*, *Sela* and *Dvayatānupassanā Suttas* (at *SnA.* 351,

2. *Vasala*, *Brāhmaṇadhammika*, *Sundarikabhāradvāja*, *Māgha* and *Vāseṭṭha*.

3. *Kasibhāradvāja*, *Subhāsita*, *Sabhiya*, *Sela* and *Dvayatānupassanā*.



405, 394, and 398, 400, 414, 456 and 504 respectively). The *vatthu-gāthā* of the *Nālaka Sutta* and *Pārāyana Vagga* also belonged to the *saṅgītikārā* according to the Commentary (*SnA.* 483 and 580 respectively).

On a broad basis, the language, metre and style of the passages which are attributed to the *saṅgītikārā* are no different from those of the other parts of the ballads to which they belong, for, their language, like that of the rest of the *gāthās* in the *Sutta Nipāta* preserves an earlier phase of Pali than the standard Canonical expression of the prose of the *Sutta Nipāta*. (Also *vide* Geiger, *Pali Literatur und Sprache*, p. 1.). It is quite probable that in most cases this “narrative element” in verse goes back to the time of the composition of the ballads themselves.

On the other hand, the narrative prose in its present form cannot, in any way, date back earlier than the period when the Canonical prose idiom was gradually being fixed and acquired an accepted standard form. It is not improbable that this prose dates back only to the time of the arrangement of the *Sutta Nipāta* as a separate work. Prior to that time no fixed prose narrative may have been attached to these ballads, and the reciters used their own words when necessary. Thus, the prose in the *Sutta Nipāta* can be considered as being much younger than the *gāthās*.

## 18

The poetical pieces in the *Sutta Nipāta* are of three main types:—1. Simple didactic verse, 2. Dialogue in verse and 3. (Didactic) discourse or dialogue following a prose introduction. Type 2 can be further subdivided into (a) pure dialogue in verse, (b) dialogue consisting of a discourse in answer to a question.

There are 21 *suttas* belonging to type I, *viz.* I. 1, 3, 8, 11, 12; II. 1, 3, 6, 8, 10; III. 8; IV. 1-6, 8, 12, 13 and 15. Some of these *suttas* like I. 1 (*Uraga*) and I. 3 (*Khaggavisāṇa*) etc. are simple ballads with a regular refrain running through them. Others like I. 8 (*Metta*), II. 1 (*Ratana*) and II. 3 (*Hiri*) etc. dilate on certain topics of religious or doctrinal importance; still others such as some of the *suttas* from the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* (included in the above list) show the attitude of a true follower of the Buddha to certain then-current issues. The last two sub-types are more in the nature of discourses rather than simple ballads.

There are 30 pieces belonging to type 2; 20 of which *viz.* I. 2, 5, 9; IV. 9 and V. 2-17 (the sixteen *pucchās*) can be said to belong to type 2(a) i.e. dialogues in verse. Class 2 (b) consists of the 10 *suttas*, II. 2, 9, 11, 13; III. 11; IV. 7, 10, 11, 14 and 16 in which a discourse in verse is given in reply to a question asked by an interlocutor.

Type 3 consisting of the so-called ‘‘Mixed Ballads’’ includes 16 *suttas*; viz. I. 6, 7, 10; II. 4, 5, 7, 12, 14; III. 3-7, 9, 10 and 12. Some of the *suttas* like I. 7 (*Vasala*), II. 4 (*Mahāmaṅgala*), III. 3 (*Sundarikabhāradvāja*), III. 5 (*Māgha*) etc. are discourses in the form of ballads; while others like I. 6 (*Parābhava*) I. 10 (*Ālavaka*) and II. 12 (*Dhammika*) are dialogues on matters of doctrinal importance.

The other 5 pieces which are not included in the above classification are I. 4 (*Kasibhāradvāja S.*), a prose and verse mixed narrative with dialogue, V. 18 (the epilogue to the *Pārāyana*) a prose and verse mixed narrative, and III. 1 (*Pabbajjā S.*) III. 2 (*Padhāna S.*) and V. 1 (the *Vatthu-gāthā* of the *Pārāyana*, simple narratives in verse.)

## 19

The ballads of the *Sutta Nipāta* are popular in character, though they describe incidents connected with the Buddha and his teaching. There is a great deal of popular lore incorporated in the *gāthās* e.g. *Sn.* 137-141, 667-678, etc. There are also many popular teachings in some of the *suttas*, e.g., 1, 6, 7, 8 and the late *Ratana Sutta* (II. 1); but all of them are at the same time characteristically Buddhist. The ballads also contain many passages and ideas common to the earlier *Upaniṣads* and the Epics; (*vide* Katre, *op. cit.*).

Besides these similarities that the *Sutta Nipāta* bears to the earlier *Upaniṣads* and epic literature, it has much in common with the earlier Sanskrit literature even in form. The narrative-ballads, viz. *Pabbajjā*, *Padhāna* and *Nālaka* (*vatthu-gāthā* only) *Suttas* have their counterpart in the *ākhyāna* (ballad) literature in Sanskrit. Their common characteristic is the alternation of dialogue stanzas with narrative stanzas. Discussing these *suttas* Winternitz (*op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 96) remarks that they are ‘‘precious remnants of that ancient sacred ballad-poetry from which the later epic version of the life of Buddha grew, in the same way as the heroic epic grew out of the secular ballads or *ākhyānas*.’’

In the same way, the riddle poetry found in the *Sutta Nipāta*, such as the *Ālavaka* and *Hemavata Suttas* in which a *yakkha* asks a question has parallels in the *Mahābhārata* (*vide* Winternitz, *ibid.* Vo. I, p. 352 and P.V. Bapat, The nāgarī edition of the *Sutta Nipāta*, p. XVII). The poetical riddles or *brahmodya* of the *Rgveda*, e.g. I. 164, VIII. 29 are not very different from the riddle-poetry of the *Sutta Nipāta* (*cp.* *Kasibhāradvāja S.*). The mixed prose and verse narrative dialogues of the *Brāhmanas* are an exact parallel to the ‘‘Mixed-Ballads’’ of the *Sutta Nipāta*. From these it is evident that the early Buddhists not only used the same traditional floating literary material, but also made use of the same literary modes common to the earlier Sanskrit literature.



The dramatic element which is not rare in the *Sutta Nipāta* has its parallels in the earlier literature. It is clearly noticeable at I. 2. (*Dhaniya S.*), I. 9 (*Hemavata S.*), III. 2 (*Padhāna S.*) and IV. 9 (*Māgandiya S.*). It may be said that the majority of the dialogue ballads can be dramatised; but in the absence of any positive evidence it cannot be established with certainty that any of them were dramatised in early times. There is only a certain degree of probability.<sup>4</sup>

There is no doubt that these ballads *were sung*. The internal evidence of the *Sutta Nipāta* itself testifies to it; e.g. Sn. 81=480 *gathābhigītā* (what is obtained by *singing stanzas*), Sn. 682a, *Seḷenti gāvanti ca vādiyanti* (they cry exultantly, *sing* and play instrumental music). As suggested by Katre (*op. cit.*) it is probable that these stanzas were sung to the accompaniment of music (cp. Sn. 682a); but the only evidence he puts forward is the occurrence of the word *vīṇā* (lute) at Sn. 449b, *vīṇā kacchā abhassatha* (the lute dropped from under his arm lit. arm-pit). Judging from the fact that a *vīṇā* (which is usually associated with his three daughters) was incongruous with the *early* Māra-legend and that the parallel line in *Mahāvastu* reads, *vināśaṃ gacchi ucchriti* (His pride was all shattered—*Māvastu*. II. 240) much significance cannot be attached to this line. However, the very form of the *gāthās* suggests that they were sung, and it is probable that the regular dialogue ballads were sung on suitable occasions (*samajjas*?) by two or more reciters, each singing the respective words spoken by the characters in the ballad.

In the *Dhaniya Sutta* for instance, two reciters would sing the alternate stanzas representing the dialogue between the herdsman Dhaniya and the Buddha, a third would introduce Sn. 30, the words of the narrator, while Māra appears singing Sn. 33. Here is a regular dramatic piece. Such ballads can be compared with the *ākhyāna*-hymns of the *Rgveda* (e.g. the hymn about Saramā and the Panīs, *Rv.* X. 108, or the dialogue between Yama and Yāmī, *Rv.* X. 10), which are regarded by some as the earliest forms of dramatic literature in India and by others as ballads (*vide* Ghate's *Lectures on Rgveda*, p. 121 n. 1). In fact, the *ākhyāna*-hymns of the *Rgveda*, on account of their dual characteristic of being ballads and dramatic pieces at the same time, can be said to bear a very close resemblance to the dialogue ballads of the *Sutta Nipāta*.

(Continued)

4. There are numerous references in the *Nikāyas* to dramatic performances, e.g., *naṭa*, *nacca*, *visūkadassana*, *pekkhā*, *samajja* and *sobhanika*; *vide* O. H. de A. Wijesekera, "Buddhist Evidence for the Early Existence of Drama." *I.H.Q.* XVII, where he has analysed the data giving many references. It is probable that Buddhist ballads were dramatically recited at *Samajjas* and similar occasions.



# A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUTTA NIPĀTA

N. A. Jayawickrama

## Additional Abbreviations

- AA—*Manorathapūraṇī* (Aṅguttara Nikāya Commentary: PTS, 5 vols., 1924-57; reprinted 1964-73)
- Ap—*Apadāna* (PTS, 2 vols., 1925-7)
- DhA—*Dhammapada* Commentary (PTS, 5 vols., 1906-15; reprinted 1970)
- Divy.—*Divyāvadāna* (ed. E. B. Cowell and R. A. Neil, Cambridge, 1886)
- D.P.P.N.—G. P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names* (India Office Library, London, 1937; PTS, 1960)
- I.A.—*Indian Antiquary* (Bombay, 1872-1933; 1964-)
- It.—*Itivuttaka* (PTS, 1890; reprinted 1975)
- J.A.—*Journal Asiatique* (Paris, 1822-)
- J.D.L.—*Journal of the Department of Letters* (Calcutta)
- J.P.T.S.—*Journal of the Pali Text Society* (London, 1882-1927)
- J.R.A.S.—*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London, 1843—)
- Katre—S. M. Katre, “Early Buddhist Ballads and their relation to the Older Upanishadic Literature” (Ph.D. thesis, London University, 1932)
- Kh.—*Khuddakapāṭha* (PTS, 1915; reprinted 1959)
- Kvu—*Kathāvatthu* (PTS, 2 vols., 1894-7)
- Lal.—*Lalitavistara* (ed. S. Lefmann, Halle, 1902/8)
- Mhv/Mvastu—*Mahāvastu* (ed. E. Senart, 3 vols., Paris, 1882-97; tr. J.J. Jones, SBB, 3 vols., 1949-56)
- Nd.—*Niddesa, Cūla* (PTS, 1918); *Mahā* (PTS, 2 vols., 1916-7)
- Reden—K. E. Neumann, *Die Reden Gotamo Buddhos. Aus der Sammlung der Bruchstücke.* (Leipzig, 1911; Munich, 1924; Zurich and Vienna, 1957)
- S.H.B.—Simon Hewavitarne Bequest (Colombo)
- U.C.R.—*University of Ceylon Review* (1943-67)
- Ud.—*Udāna* (PTS, 1885, reprinted 1948)
- UdA—*Udāna* Commentary (PTS, 1926)
- Vin.—*Vinaya Piṭaka* (PTS, 5 vols., 1879-83; reprinted 1964)
- Vsm.—*Visuddhimagga* (PTS, 2 vols., 1920-1)
- Corrections to Vol. I, No. 2: P. 75*—DA refers to the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* (Dīgha Nikāya Commentary: PTS, 3 vols., 1886, 1931-2; reprinted 1968-71).
- P. 81, line 16—*Thai Shu* refers to the *Taishō* (Tokyo) edition of the Chinese Tripiṭaka.

## THE VAGGAS OF THE SUTTA NIPĀTA

The *Aṭṭhaka* and the *Pārāyana Vaggas* appear to have been independent collections long before the existence of a separate work called the *Sutta Nipāta*. The *Culla Niddesa* which comments on the *Pārāyana Vagga* and *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* and the *Mahā Niddesa* which comments on the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* form the eleventh book of the *Khuddaka Nikāya*. They make no specific reference to the *Sutta Nipāta*. In spite of the fact that these two works were commentaries they came to be reckoned as canonical texts, and in turn were commented upon in the fashion of all canonical works.<sup>1</sup> The fact that the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana Vaggas* and *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* had, at one stage, existed independent of a specific collection, does not necessarily prove that all other *suttas* in *Sn.* are late. The *Niddesas* themselves quote from *suttas* which came to be later included in *Sn.*, besides quoting from other works in the Canon, and parts of *Sn.* already commented upon in the *Niddesas*.<sup>2</sup>

### 21

#### Asoka's Bhābru Edict

Some of the *suttas* included in *Sn.* are mentioned by Asoka in his Bhābru Edict (*vide* U.C.R. VI. 2 p. 81), but often under different names. The Edict inculcates the study of the following passages:—

1. *Vinaya-samukase,*
2. *Aliya-vasāni,*
3. *Anāgatā-bhayāni,*
4. *Muni-gāthā,*
5. *Moneyya-Sūte,*
6. *Upatisa-pasine* and
7. *Lāghulovāde musāvādam adhigicya.*

---

1. *Saddhammapajjotikā*, the commentary on the *Niddesas* was composed during the reign of Aggabodhi I who ascended the throne (of Ceylon) in 554 A.C. (*vide* *Sdpj.* I. vii).

2. *Vide* Nd 1. ed. L. de la Vallée Poussin and E. J. Thomas pp. 513-515 and Nd 2 ed. W. Stede pp. 289-290. *Sabhiya Sutta* is quoted from no less than 14 times, i.e. *Sn.* 514, is quoted at Nd 1. 71, Nd 2. 220; *Sn.* 516 at Nd 1. 244; *Sn.* 519 at Nd 1. 87, Nd 2. 214; *Sn.* 522 (cp. A. III. 345) at Nd 1. 202, Nd 2. 180; *Sn.* 527 at Nd 1. 58, 221, 336; *Sn.* 529 at Nd 1. 93, 205, Nd 2. 256 and *Sn.* 531 at Nd 2. 255. *Sūciloma S.* is Quoted from 4 times i.e. *Sn.* 271 at Nd 1. 16, 364, 471 and Nd 2. 201; *Padhāna S.* also 4 times, viz. *Sn.* 436-439 at Nd 1. 96, 174, 333 and Nd 2. 253; *Magandiya S.* twice, viz. *Sn.* 844 at Nd 1. 179, 200, and *Dhotakamāṇavapucchā* (*Sn.* 1064), *Mogharājamāṇavapucchā*; (*Sn.* 1119), *Salla* (*Sn.* 576-581 ab cp. D. II. 120), *Dvayatānupassanā* (*Sn.* 740-741) and *Nālaka* (*Sn.* 715) *Suttas* once each at Nd 1. 32, 438, 121, 455 and Nd 2. 118 respectively.



Of these seven *dhammapaliyāyas* (sections of the Scriptures) only Nos. 1, 4, 5 and 6 have been observed by scholars to be identical with passages in *Sn*. All the seven passages are identified to some measure of satisfaction.<sup>3</sup>

**Vinaya-samukase** (1) ‘‘the Exalted Treatise on Moral Discipline’’ is identified with the *Sāṃukkaṃsikā Dhammadesanā* (*Ud.* V. 3) by A. J. Edmunds in *J.R.A.S.* 1913 p. 387. Dr. B. M. Barua (*J.R.A.S.* 1915 p. 809) identifies it with the *Siṅgālovāda Suttanta* (*D.* III. 180-194) arguing that *Ariyassa vinaya* which is the topic of discussion there is implied by the term *Vinaya-samukase* and that it was intended for the clergy and the laity alike. S.N. Mitra (*I.A.* 1919 pp. 8-11) suggests the *Sappurisa Sutta* (*M.* III, 37-45) on account of the occurrence of the words *vinayādhāra* and *attānaṃ samukkaṃseti*. Bhandarkar (*Asoka* pp. 87-88) attempts to prove its identity with the *Tuṇḍaka Sutta* of *Sn*. (*Sn.* 915-934) from the fact that it is included by Buddhaghosa in a list of four *suttas*, three of which can be identified with three of Asoka’s *dhammapaliyāyas*. He adduces further interval evidence and maintains that the Buddha expounds religious practices here, for, *pāṭimokkha*, *paṭipadā* and *samādhī* are some of the topics under discussion.

**Muni-gāthā** (4) is undoubtedly the *Muni Sutta* of *Sn*. (*Sn.* 207-221).<sup>4</sup> Rhys Davids (*J.P.T.S.* 1896 p. 95) argues that if *Śaila-gāthā* (at *Divy.* 35) meant *Sela Sutta*, then *Muni-gāthā* should be the *Muni Sutta*. He further states ‘‘that Asoka should lay so much stress on this short poem is only in harmony with the tenor of the whole context in the Edict’’.

The next *dhammapaliyāya* **Moneyya-sūte** (5), is identified with the discourse of the *Nālaka Sutta* (*Sn.* 699-723). It was wrongly identified as either *A.I.* 273 or *It.* 56 (Rhys Davids *loc. cit.*); but all available evidence shows that *Moneyya-sūte* was none other than the *Nālaka*-discourse. The alternative name for the *Nālaka Sutta* in Pāli itself is *Moneyya Sutta* (Chalmers xi), which perhaps owes its origin to the opening word *moneyyam*. Further, the *Sūtra* in *Mvastu*. that corresponds to this discourse is also called *Mauneya* (*Mvastu.* III. 387 ff.). The short and unimpressive prose passages at *A.I.* 273 and *It.* 56 could not in any way have been the *Moneyya-sūte* of Asoka, though they deal with *Moneyyāni* in brief.

Oldenberg and Rhys Davids attempt to identify **Upatisa-pasine** (6) with a *Vinaya* passage (*Vinaya Texts* 3. 149 i.e. *Vin.* I. 39-41) which gives the story of Sāriputta’s conversion as a result of his question to Assaji.

3. Vide Hultsch, *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. I, pp. 172-174 ff.; Dharmānanda Kosambi, *I. A.*, 1912 pp. 37 ff.; Rhys Davids, *J.P.T.S.* 1896 pp. 93 ff.; *J.R.A.S.* 1898 pp. 683 ff.; Rādhakumud Mookerji, *Asoka*, pp. 117 ff.; D. R. Bhandarkar, *Asoka*, pp. 85 ff.; J.D.L. (Calcutta) xx, pp. 1-7; Sylvain Lévi, *J.A.* 7, 475 ff.; and Oldenberg, *Vinaya Piṭakam* I, xl ff.

4. Vide Dharmānanda Kosambi, *I. A.* 1912 pp. 37 ff.; Mookerji, *Asoka* pp. 16 ff. and Bhandarkar, *Asoka* 85 ff.



Rhys Davids elaborates further on this in *J.R.A.S.* 1893 p. 693 and *J.P.T.S.* 1896 pp. 97-98. But Dharmānanda Kosambi (*I.A.* 1912 p. 40) identifies it with *Sāriputta Sutta* (*Sn.* 955-975). It is generally accepted that the passages mentioned by Asoka are short pieces. The people were instructed to study these *dharmaparyāyas* and perhaps learn them by heart as was the practice then. A passage in verse lends itself easier for memorising than one in prose, and has more poetic appeal. This alone is sufficient reason why *Upatisa-pasine* cannot be the prose *sutta* at *Vin.* I. 39-41.

The seventh "section of the scriptures" called the "Exhortation to Rahula, beginning on the subject of Falsehood" has so far been identified as the *Ambalatthikā Rāhulovāda Sutta* (*M.I.* 414-420),<sup>5</sup> but the probability is that it perhaps referred to a *Rāhula Sutta* in verse. The only *Rāhula Sutta* in verse in the Pāli Canon, is found at *Sn.* 335-342. But the *sutta* as it exists now, cannot be easily identified with *Lāghulovāde musāvādam adhigicaya*, as it neither begins with (*adhi*+ $\sqrt{kr.}$ ), nor deals with the topic of *musāvāda* (falsehood) anywhere in the body of the *sutta*. It has been pointed out by Katre that probably the *Vatthugāthā* (*Sn.* 335-336) formed a part of a different *Rāhula Sutta* and that the concluding sentence in prose links them with the rest of the *sutta*. He further states that the clue to the verses is found only in the prose formula at the end of the *sutta*. This other *Rāhula Sutta*, presumably a part of which is now preserved as *Vatthu-gāthā* in *Sn.* was probably the *sutta* mentioned by Asoka. But all this is purely conjectural. No definite connection can be established between *Sn.* 335-336 and *M.I.* 414-420, the other *Rāhula Sutta*; and there is no conclusive proof that No. 7 in the Edict had any connections with *Sn.* 335-336 or *Sn.* 335-342. The only reasons for suspecting that they were connected are:—

1. The *Rāhula Sutta* in *Sn.* is a comparatively short piece in verse.
2. The two, *Lāghulovāda* and *Rāhula Sutta* refer to the same person (*Rāhula*).
3. This *dharmapaliyāya* follows three others in the Edict which are identified with certainty to belong to the same type of literature (i.e. pieces now preserved in *Sn.*).

Eliminating the *Rāhula Sutta* as doubtful there yet remain four *suttas* of *Sn.* in Asoka's list. The consensus of opinion among scholars is that *Munigāthā*, *Moneyya-sūte* and *Upatisa-pasine* referred to *suttas* which were included in *Sn.* Perhaps Bhandarkar is correct when he identifies *Vinayasamukase* as the *Tuvaṭṭaka Sutta*.<sup>6</sup> There is no doubt that these *suttas* existed at least as early as the 3rd century B.C. For lack of further evidence it is incorrect to presuppose the existence of *Sn.* prior to the time

5. Rhys Davids *J.P.T.S.* 1896 p. 95.

6. *op. cit.*

of Asoka as there is no specific mention of it either in inscriptions or in any Canonical work.

## 22

## The Aṭṭhaka Vagga

*The Episode of Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa.*

On the other hand, the early existence of the *Aṭṭhaka* and the *Pārāvana Vaggas* as separate collections, can be deduced from the references made to them in other works. The earliest mention of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* is at *Vin. I. 196*, in the episode of *Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa*, which repeats itself in many other works with various additions and alterations.<sup>7</sup> The *Vinaya* passage runs...*āyasmā Soṇo sabbān'eva Aṭṭhakavaggikāni sareṇa abhāsi* (the venerable *Soṇa* recited all the sections—or *suttas*—of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* with proper intonation). At *Ud. 59* the precise number of *suttas* in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* is also mentioned...*āyasmā Soṇo...soḷasa Aṭṭhakavaggikāni sabbān'eva sareṇa abhāsi* (the venerable *Soṇa* recited all the 16—*suttas*—of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* with proper intonation). *Dh A. IV. 102*, *UdA. 312*, *AA.I. 241* and *Th 1 A. I. 459* relate this incident in very much the same words, but with additional commentarial gloss.

The *Avadāna* of *Koṭikarṇa* (*Divy. 20*), which is an extract from the *Vinaya* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādins*<sup>8</sup> mentions the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*: *Athāyusmāñchroṇo bhagavatā kṛtāvakāśah asmātparāntikayā guptikayā Udānāt, Pārāyanāt, Satyadr̥ṣṭah, Śailagāthā, Munigāthā, Arthavargīyāni* (v.i. *arthavadgīyāni*) *ca sūtrāṇi vistareṇa svareṇa svādhyāyaṃ karoti*. (Then the venerable *Soṇa*, with the approval of the *Bhagavā*, rehearsed in detail, with intonation in the accent of an *Aparāntika*, passages from the *Udāna* and *Pārāyana*, the *Satyadr̥ṣṭa* (?), the *Śaila-gāthā* (*Sela S*), *Munigāthā* (*Muni S*.) and the *sūtras* of the *Arthavarga*).

In the *Avadāna* of *Pūrṇa* at *Divy. 34-35*, the merchants who embarked with *Pūrṇa* are said to have recited the *Udāna*, *Pārāyana*, *Satyadarśa*, *Sthaviragāthā*, *Śailagāthā*, *Munigāthā* and the *Arthavargīya Sūtra*.

In the *Vinaya* of the *Sarvāstivādins* which is found in Chinese<sup>9</sup> (*Tok. XVI. 4. 56a*), *Śroṇa* is said to have recited the *Pārāyana* and the *Satyadarśa*. The Buddha complements his *Avantī* pronunciation.

7. The episode of *Soṇa* (*Śroṇa*) in *Pāli* and *BSk.* is fully analysed and critically studied by *Sylvain Lévi* in *J.A. 1915 pp. 401 ff.*

8. Vide *Huber, B.E.F.E.O. 1907*, *Sylvain Lévi, T'oung Pao 1907* and *M. Choyannes, Cinq cents Contes et-Apologues II, 237 ff.*

9. I am indebted to *Prof. Sylvain Lévi's* analysis of the *Śroṇa Episode* in *J.A. 1915*, for these references.



The *Vinaya* of the Mahīśāsakas, preserved in Chinese (Tok. XVI, 2. 30a), contains a version similar to the Pāli account in the *Vinaya*; but the number of *suttas* is specified as in the *Udāna*.

The account in the *Vinaya* of the Dharmaguptakas resembles the version in Pāli and the account in the *Vinaya* of the Mahīśāsakas. Here (Tok. XV. 5. 53b; chap. 39) Koṭikarṇa is said to have recited the 16 *Arthapada* without addition or omission.

In the *Vinaya* of the Mahāsaṅghikas (Tok. XV. 9.61a; chap. 23) Śroṇa recites the *Aśṭavarga* (Ch. *Chu Pa-ch'un-ching*), and the Buddha questions him on the phrases (*pada*) and the meaning (*artha*).

In all these accounts, except in the *Vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins, the *Arthavargīyāni* or the *Aṭṭhakavaggikāni* are mentioned. The additional list of titles in Sanskrit texts is a mere expansion though Sylvain Lévi does not consider it an interpolation:

“On pourrait être tenté de croire que la liste des titres donnée dans le texte sanscrit est une interpolation, si la version tibétaine du *Dulva* ne venait pas contrôler—et sur certains points rectifier—le texte sanscrit.” (*ibid.* p. 412). The Tibetan version parallel to the *Vinaya* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādins* is at *Dulva* I. 378-405 (cf. *Divy.* I, Ch. Tok. XVII. 4. 104e-190b).

## 23

### Other References in Buddhist Sanskrit Works

Besides the episode of Soṇa (Śroṇa), there are numerous references to, and quotations from the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*. Vasubandhu in his *Abhidharmakośa* quotes the following verse:—

*Tasya cet kāmāyānasya chandajātasya dehinaḥ  
te kāmā na samṛdhyanti śalyavidhva iva rūpyate*

and attributes it to the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* (cp. *Sn.* 767).

Yaśomitra in his *Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā* comments: *Tathā hyarthavargīyeṣūktam iti: Arthavargīyāni sūtrāṇi yāni Kṣudrake paṭhyante teṣūktam; tasya cet kāmāyānasya iti vistaraḥ. Tasya dehinaḥ kāmāyānasya chandajātasya yadi kāmā viṣayā na samṛdhyanti na sampadyante śalyavidhva ivāsau rūpyate bādhyate ityarthah.* (This is what is meant by the statement that it has been so said in the *Arthavargīyas*: It is stated in the *sūtras* of the *Arthavargīya* found in the *Kṣudraka* (*Nikāya* or *Āgama*?) that the meaning of “if of him who desires etc.” is, “If the desires and sense-pleasures of a being who yearns and craves for such pleasures are not satisfied nor fulfilled he sulks and is perturbed like one shot with an arrow”).

Bodhisattvabhūmi (p. 48) commenting on the word *kānti* says thus, *Uktam ca bhagavatā Arthavargīyeṣu,*

*Yā kaścana samvṛtayo hi loke, sarvā hi tā munir nopaiti*

*Anupago hyasau kena upādatīta, dṛṣṭāsrute kāntim asamprakurvan* (cf. Sn. 897). ‘‘And so it has been said by the Bhagavā in the *Arthavargīyas*, ‘‘Whatever conventions of the world there are, none of them affects the muni (sage), for he does not move with them, wherefore shall he who forms no sense-attachment to what is seen and heard be guided (by them)?’’

The reading *kāntim* in Bodhisattvabhūmi sheds a new light on the interpretation of the line Sn. 897 d. All MSS., except two Burmese MSS. (Nos. 4 and 5 mentioned at Sn. p.v., P.T.S. ed.) which read *khanti*, agree on the reading *khantim*. Nd 2. 165 considers *khanti* as a synonym for *diṭṭhi*, *ruci*, *laddhi*, *ajjhāsaya* and *adhippāya*, perhaps guided by the occurrence of *diṭṭha* and *suta* at other passages in Sn.<sup>10</sup> Sn. A. 558 comments on it as: *khantimakubbamāno, ti. pemam akaronto*. Chalmers translates Sn. 897d as, ‘‘when phenomena of sense appeal to them no more,’’ Fausböll, ‘‘he who is not pleased with what has been seen and heard,’’ Neumann, *Beim Sehn und Hören angehalten nimmer*, and E. M. Hare, ‘‘why give accord to things of sight and ear?’’ All these translators apparently translate the idea correctly, but none of them seems to have questioned the text. According to the reading *khantim* the corresponding Sk. would be *kṣāntim* (patience).<sup>11</sup> The word *khanti* in a context like this may be translated as, ‘‘tolerance for’’ or even ‘‘(developing) a weakness for,’’ but such a translation appears unnatural and laboured. If the text had been *kantim* (from  $\sqrt{kam}$ ) and not *khantim*, the idea conveyed would be more in keeping with the context. The reading *khantim* in BSk. cannot be brushed aside as a wrong Sanskritisation for Pāli *khantim*. On the other hand, it may perhaps go back to a reading much earlier than Pāli.

There are also a number of passages and lines common to the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* and other Pāli works. They are fully examined by Franke.<sup>12</sup>

## 24

### The Chinese Arthapadam

The complete *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* together with additional stories as a background is found in the Chinese Tripitaka although ‘‘it can be said with

10. This idea occurs no less than 18 times in Sn. viz. Sn. 797 b=887 a, 793 ab=914 ab, 798 cd, 887 ab (887 b=790 b), 910 ab, 1079 ab=1080 bc, 1082 cd=1083 cd. 788 b=789 a, 802 ab, 897 d and 778 d=250 d. All these instances (except 250 d) are, found in the sections commented in Nd 1 and 2.

11. Vide E. J. Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought*, p. 171 and s.v. P.T.S.

12. Vide R. Otto Franke, *Die Sutta Nipāta Gāthās mit ihren Parallelen*, Z.D.M.G. 1909-1912 and E. M. Hare, *Woven Cadences*, (S.B.B. Vol. XV), pp. 203-206.



certainty that there is not and has never existed a Chinese version of the *Sutta Nipāta*.<sup>13</sup> This section called the *I-tsu* or *Yi-tsou king* (*Arthapadam*) is a translation dating back to the beginning of the 3rd century A.C., according to Anesaki. It occurs as No. 198 in the Taishō Tripiṭaka. The 16 pieces occur in the following order:-

<i>Kāma Sutta</i> contains	8 lines with 3	<i>pādas</i> each	(No. 1 in Pāli <i>Aṭṭhaka Vagga</i> ).
<i>Guhaṭṭhaka S.</i>	16	2	(No. 2
<i>Duṭṭhaṭṭhaka S.</i>	4 & 12	2	(No. 3
<i>Suddhaṭṭhaka S.</i>	16	2	(No. 4
<i>Paramaṭṭhaka S.</i>	16	2	(No. 5
<i>Jarā S.</i>	20	2	(No. 6
<i>Tissametteyya S.</i>	20	2	(No. 7
<i>Pasūra S.</i>	23	2	(No. 8
<i>Māgandiya S.</i>	27	2	(No. 9
<i>Kalahavivāda S.</i>	32	2	(No. 11
<i>Cūlavīyñha S.</i>	34	2	(No. 12
<i>Mahāvīyūha S.</i>	40	2	(No. 13
<i>Tuvaṭṭaka S.</i>	40	2	(No. 14
<i>Sāriputta S.</i>	16 & 24	2	(No. 16
<i>Purābheda S.</i>	28	2	(No. 10
<i>Attadaṇḍa S.</i>	40	2	(No. 15

In addition to the prose incorporated with these verses there occur some additional stanzas. The lines beginning with *na socanāya* at A. II. 62 are found at No. 1 and Sn. 152-179 in No. 13 of the Chinese version, i.e. *Tuvaṭṭaka Sutta*.

All this evidence helps to show that the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* as a collection is old, and Sylvain Lōvi<sup>14</sup> concludes, *Nous sommes en droit de classer L'Arthavarga parmi les monuments les plus anciens de la littérature bouddhique*.

## 25

### Aṣṭaka Varga or Arthaka Varga?

The title *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* calls for attention next. The name *Aṭṭhaka* suggests that the *vagga* consists of octaves or *suttas* with eight stanzas each, but only four of its *suttas* (viz. Nos. 2-5) are proper octaves. It cannot be determined whether these *suttas* were *aṭṭhakas* (*aṣṭakas*—octaves) or *atthakas* (*arthakas*—meaningful utterances) to begin with. Pāli tradition has been very strong in insisting on the name *Aṭṭhaka*. It was customary for Pāli compilers to resort to artificial means such as numerals, in their classifications. They may have deemed it proper to call a section *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* even though only a small proportion of its *suttas* consisted of real octaves. Similar instances may be seen in works like *udāna* where an important *sutta* in a *vagga* gives the name to the whole of it. It was not considered necessary that all the *suttas* in the *vagga* should consist of 8 stanzas each, unlike the majority of the *nipātas* (the earlier ones) of

13. Anesaki, J.P.T.S. 1906-1907, p. 50.

14. J. A. 1915, p. 417.



*Th* 1 and *Th* 2. It would be incorrect to say that only these four *aṭṭhakas* formed the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* and that the other *suttas* were subsequently added or grafted from other places. This would imply a tacit acceptance of the incomplete artificial classification of Pāli compilers as final. In fact, the *vagga* follows a systematic arrangement in which the *sutta* with the least number of verses is placed first and proceeds gradually in ascending numerical order till the *suttas* with the highest number of verses are placed last. The order of arrangement of the *suttas* need not necessarily be as old as the *vagga* itself, for the Chinese version follows a slightly different order. However, nothing conclusive can be inferred from this.

Almost all the references to the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* which mention the number of *suttas* in it speak of the *Soḷasa aṭṭhakavaggikāṇi* (*Ud.* 59, *Ud A.* 312, *DhA.* IV. 102 and *AA.* I. 241). The Chinese version was seen to contain the 16 *suttas* in full. Despite this general agreement *Th* 1 A. speaks of “*addhuddhasoḷasa aṭṭhakavaggikāṇi*”: (*Th* 1 A. I. 459 *S.H.B.*, commentary on *Soṇatthera*’s verses at *Th* 1. 365-369). This statement would imply that the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* consisted of 56 ( $3\frac{1}{2} \times 16$ ) *suttas*—an impossibility. Commentarial tradition cannot always be relied upon; and in all probability this statement may have been an exaggeration like the passage at *AA.* IV. 35 which speaks of 250 stanzas of the *Pārāyana*, when in actual practice the whole *vagga*, including the *Vatthu-gāthās* and Epilogue contains only 174 stanzas. The statement at *Th.* 1 A.I. 459 can also be interpreted as “56 stanzas of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*.” It is not possible to find out to what *suttas* these 56 stanzas belonged. Obviously the 32 stanzas which form the four regular octaves should be included in this number. This leaves 24 verses which should be expected to belong to three other regular octaves; but no such *suttas* are to be found in the *vagga*. Furthermore, there is no possible combination of two or more *suttas* which brings about a total of 24 stanzas. There is no justifiable reason why a commentary of so late a date as 5th century A.C. should ignore some of the *suttas* and speak of only 56 stanzas when *Nd* 2. *Vin.* I. 196 and *Ud.* 59, leaving aside contemporary commentarial literature, confirm that it *did* consist of 16 *suttas*. The reading, *addhuddhasoḷasa aṭṭhakavaggikāṇi* is incompatible with evidence furnished by all other sources and therefore can be summarily dismissed as a Commentarial error.

Pāli works uniformly refer to this section as *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* though BSk. and Chinese Buddhist works give it different names. It is called *Arthavargīyāṇi Sūtrāṇi* (v.1. *arthavadgīyāṇi*) at *Divy.* 20 and 35. Vasubandhu and Yaśomitra (*supra*) call it *Arthavargīya*. Bodhisattvabhūmi too refers to it as *Arthavargīya*. The Chinese version gives the name as *I-tsuo* or *Yi-tsou-king* (*Arthapadam*). In the episode of Śroṇa found in the *Vinaya* of the



Mahīśāsakas<sup>15</sup> (Ch. Tok. XVI. 2. 30a) the reference is to the sixteen *Arthakavargīya* (Ch. Yi-pin=*Artha-varga*). The *Vinaya* of the Dharmaguptakas (Tok. XV. 5. 53b) has it as the sixteen *Arthapada* (Ch. Yi-kiu=*Artha-pada*). In the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins it is called the *Arthavargīyāni Sūtrāni* (Dulva: *don kyi choms kyi mdo*). The Sarvāstivād in *Vinaya* calls it the *Artha-vargīya Sūtra* (Tok. XVII. 4. 9b, Col. 5; Ch. Yi-tsing=*Artha-vargīya*). At Tok. XVI. 4. 56a it is called *A-tch'a-p' o-k'i-ye-sieou-to-lou*, *sūtra des vertues rassemblées* and is identified by Lévi (*ibid.*) as *Arthavargīya Sūtra*.

It is significant that the majority of these works refer to it as *Artha* (*ka*)-*varga* or *Artha-pada*. The *Vinaya* of the Mahāsaṅghikas alone speaks of an *Aṣṭa-varga*, but even here the idea of *artha* and *pada* is not absent. It is said that the Buddha questioned Śroṇa on the phrases (*pada*) and the meaning (*artha*) after his recital (Tok. XV. 9. 61a, chap. 23). The *Vinaya* of the Mahāsaṅghikas thus preserves the Pāli tradition at the same time reflecting another common to the rest of the BSk. works. It is quite probable that this section was originally not meant to be described as the ‘Eights,’ and BSk. may have preserved an earlier tradition which called these *Aṭṭhakas Arthakas*. The four octaves were probably *Arthakas* (*Atthaka*-meaningful statements) at the beginning. Each of these *suttas* contains in its opening line the words used for their respective titles. *Guhaṭṭhaka* opens with, *Satto guhayam bahunābhicchanno* (Sn. 772a), *Duṭṭhaṭṭhaka* with, *Vadanti ve duṭṭhamanā, pi eke* (Sn. 780a), *Suddaṭṭhaka* with, *Passāmi suddham paramam arogam* (Sn. 788a) and *Paramaṭṭhaka* with, *Paramam ti diṭṭhīsu paribbasāno* (Sn. 796a). These words are used as illustrations in the didactic-ballad discourses to elucidate the meaning, and hence the *suttas* are *Atthakas* (*Arthakas*). It is a mere coincidence that the number of stanzas constituting each of these *suttas* happens to be eight. The word *attha* together with the secondary suffix—*ka* (*attha+ka*) may have changed into *aṭṭhaka* (probably) with the influence of Western Prākṛit which has a tendency to cerebralise dentals following an *r*; i.e.—*rt*—>—*ṭṭ*—and—*rth*—>—*ṭṭh*—. The first change is frequent in Pāli itself; e.g. Sk. *ārta* > *aṭṭa*. *Artha* itself is frequently changed to *aṭṭha*, which spelling was later restricted to a specific meaning as ‘law-suit’ (*aṭṭa*). In cpds. *artha* > *aṭṭha* in Pāli e.g. *aṭṭhakathā*, *aṭṭhuppatti*, etc (s.v., P.T.S.). In the case of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* this change perhaps was more accentuated by the mere coincidence that four of its *suttas* consisted of 8 stanzas each. The weakness of Pāli compilers to be guided by numerical classifications may have finally led to stamp down the name ‘eights’ or ‘octaves’ on this *vagga*.

The emphasis on *attha* (weal) in the Pāli Canon is evident from the

15. The following references to Chinese works are from Sylvain Lévi, *ibid.*

numerous instances in which the word occurs.<sup>16</sup> The formula, *atthāya hitāya sukhāya* (for the benefit, well-being and comfort of) which occurs all over the Canon (e.g. *D. III. 211 ff. It. 79, Kh. VIII. 1* etc.), leaving aside all other references to *attha*, testifies to the importance of this concept. It is probable that the idea underlying the *Aṭṭhakas* of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* was related to *attha* (weal) though fundamentally it was the elucidation of meaning (*attha paridīpanā*) that was aimed at. This may be seen more clearly at *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* 383 l.3.

*Evam idaṃ mahārthasya dharmaparyāyasya dhāraṇā, vācanā, deśanā Bodhisattvānām anuttarāyāḥ samyak sambodher āhārakā samvartanti,* (In like manner, the learning by heart, the reciting and the teaching of this section of the scriptures of great meaning—or benefit—tends to bring about the perfect and supreme Enlightenment of Bodhisattvas.

All this evidence seems to indicate that the term *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* (also *mahāsaṅghika Aṣṭa-varga*) was a misnomer arising from an early confusion caused by the occurrence of eight stanzas each in Nos. 2-5 of the *Vagga*. The term *Aṭṭhaka* is best interpreted as *Arthaka* as in the majority of BSk. works.

From isolated references to *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* in many Pāli works it is conjectured that ‘it may possibly have been the name of divisions of other works.’<sup>17</sup> In the whole of the Pāli Canon no other *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* can be traced though *Anguttara* has an *Aṭṭhaka Nipāta* and *Th 1* and *Th 2* contain *Aṭṭha Nipātas*. Though the absence of other *Aṭṭhaka Vaggas* does not preclude the possibility of the occurrence of other sections bearing that name no references to another *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* have been discovered so far.

## 26

### Pārāyana Vagga

The next *vagga* in importance is the *Pārāyana*. It consists of 18 pieces; viz. a prologue in verse called the *Vatthu-gāthā*, 16 short dialogues in verse called *Pucchās* and an epilogue in prose and verse. The word *Pārāyana* occurs thrice in the text itself, but all these references are to be met with in the epilogue; viz. *Sn. p. 218, Sn. 1130d and 1131a*. The prose passage at p. 218 gives a commentary-like explanation of the term *Pārāyana*: *Ekam ekassa ce pi pañhassa aṭṭham aññāya, dhammam aññāya, dhammānudhammam paṭipajjeyya, gaccheyy’ eva jarāmaranassa pāraṃ, pāraṃgamanīyā ime dhammā’ ti, tasmā imassa dhammapariyāyassa pārāyanam t’veva*

16. Vide P.T.S. (s.v.) for examples quoted.

17. Malalasekera s.v., D.P.P.N.



*adhivacanam*. (If one were to comprehend the import of each one of these questions, and realise the Dhamma therein, and follow the path in accordance with the major and minor precepts of the Law, one would cross over to the further shore of old-age and death. As these teachings lead to over-yonder, the name *Pārāyana* is given to this disquisition on the Dhamma). The two stanzas Sn. 1129-1130 express the same idea in verse and explain the title *Pārāyana*.

Although the title does not occur in any of the *Pucchās* (or *pañhas*) the central theme of the *vagga* is "The Way Beyond" or "Crossing Over." The idea of crossing over of the Flood (*ogha*) occurs 10 times.<sup>18</sup> The "passing beyond" of this "Sinful State" (*visattikā*) is mentioned 5 times,<sup>19</sup> and this is an idea common with other canonical texts, particularly *Samyutta* and *Anguttara Nikāyas*. The overcoming of birth and old-age (*jāti* and *jarā*) which is a necessary accompaniment of the "Going Beyond" is to be met with in 10 places.<sup>20</sup> An idea parallel to this is the abandoning of ( $\sqrt{hā}$  or  $pa + \sqrt{hā}$ ) sorrow, or that of *jātijarā* (or *jāti* and *jarā*), occurring 7 times in Sn.<sup>21</sup> Connected is the idea of overcoming the material substratum of birth (*upadhi*) at Sn. 1057b and 1083b. The destruction of ( $pa + \sqrt{bhid}$ ) ignorance (*avijjā*) occurs at Sn. 1105 f and 1078d, and of craving (*taṇhā*) and attachment (*kāma* and its synonyms), 9 times.<sup>22</sup> The other concepts emphasised are, the state of emancipation (*vimokha*) at Sn. 1088d, 1105e, and 1189d (the Buddha is called *vimutta*, the released, at 1101 and the emancipated one is mentioned at Sn. 1071c, 1072c, 1073c, 1074c and 1114d), cessation (*nirodha*) at Sn. 1037e, the destruction (*uparodha*, or verb  $upa + \sqrt{rudh}$ ) of evil at Sn. 1036e, 1037df, 1110b, 1111d, tranquility (*santi*) at Sn. 1066a, 1067a, the tranquilised state (*santipada*) at Sn. 1096c, *nibbāna* at Sn. 1061d, 1062d, 1094c, 1108d, 1109d and *nibbānapada* at Sn. 1086d. Ajita questions the Buddha regarding the taints of the world at Sn. 1032; the dangers arising out of the world are mentioned at Sn. 1032, 1033, of *ogha* at 1092, 1093 and of sorrow and the arising of Ill at Sn. 1033, 1049, 1050 and 1051. The escape from the evils of the world, the crossing over of the Flood and the attainment of *santi* or *nibbāna* are the dominant ideas in the *vagga*. The verb with  $\sqrt{tar}$  alone is used no less than 23 times in the *Pucchās* in addition to verbs like *pajahati*, thus justifying the title *Pārāyana*.

The word *pāra* occurs thrice in the *Pucchās* (Sn. 1059, 1105 and 1112); but in the latter two instances it is used in praise of the Buddha. In the

18. Sn. 1052 c, 1059 c, 1064 d, 1069 d, 1070 b, 1081 e, 1082 g, 1083 g, 1096 b and 1101 b.

19. Sn. 1053 d, 1054 d, 1067 d, 1085 e and 1087 d.

20. Sn. 1045 d, 1046 e, 1047 bd, 1048 d, 1052 d, 1060 d, 1079 f, 1080 f and 1081 g.

21. Sn. 1056 c, 1057 c, 1058 a, 1082 b, 1079 c, 1020 c, and 1122 f.

22. Sn. 1068 cd, 1070 cd, 1082 f, 1083 f, 1085 c, 1103 a, 1123 d, (at 1101 and 1021 it is used as an epithet of the Buddha).

whole of *Sn.* the word occurs 43 times, together with its derivatives and cpds., evenly distributed in all the five *vaggas*. Of these, *pāra*, ‘the Beyond,’ is directly mentioned in five instances; viz. *na pāram diguṇaṃ yanti* (*Sn.* 714c), *tiṇṇo ca pāraṃ akhilo akaṅkho* (*Sn.* 1059d), *gacche pāraṃ apārato* (*Sn.* 1129d) and *maccudheyyapāraṃ* (*Sn.* 1146d). ‘The idea of ‘crossing over’ is incorporated in a simile at *Sn.* 771d, and *pārasmiṃ* (*loc.*) occurs at *Sn.* 1018c and 1020d. This concept is totally different from *pāramī* or *pāramitā* of later Buddhism. *Pāraṃgata* occurs at *Sn.* 803d and *pāragata* at *Sn.* 21b, 210d, 359b and 638c. *Pāra* in the line, so *bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ* (*Sn.* 1c-17c—that monk shuns the here and the beyond) has a different connotation from *pāra* in the rest of the references. The idea that is diametrically opposed to *pāraṃ*+√*gam* is at *Sn.* 15 b, *oraṃ āgamanāya paccayāse* (casual antecedents for the return hither). The concept of ‘going beyond’ is to be met with in numerous other canonical works; e.g. *S.* IV. 174, *A.V.* 4, *M.* III. 64, *Th* 1. 771-773, etc. and is one of the most fundamental tenets in early Buddhism.

## 27

## Its Antiquity

This *vagga* appears to have been called *Pārāyana* from the earliest times.<sup>23</sup> Several canonical works refer to it and quote from it. *Sn.* 1109 is found at *S.* I. 39 in the *Devatā Saṃyutta*, and at *S.* I. 40 the same stanza occurs with its first line reading, *nandī saṃbandhano loko* instead of *nandisaṃyojano loko*. Yet there is no mention of the *Pārāyana* here. *S.* II. 47 refers to the *Ajitapañha* when quoting *Sn.* 1038, and the stanza is quoted again at *S.* II. 49 making it the topic of discourse up to p. 50. *Aṅguttara* refers to the *Pārāyana* 6 times. At *A.* I. 133 *Puṇṇakapañha* of the *Pārāyana* is mentioned and *Sn.* 1048 quoted. At *A.* II. 45-46 the same stanza is quoted thus: *Imā kho bhikkhave catasso samādhībhāvanā, idaṃ pana etaṃ sandhāya bhāsitaṃ Pārāyane Puṇṇakapañhe* (These indeed, O monks, are the four meditations on concentration; it has been declared so in the *Puṇṇakapañha* of the *Pārāyana* regarding this). The *Udayapañha* of the *Pārāyana* is mentioned at *A.* I 134, and *Sn.* 1106, 1107 are quoted from it. *A.* III. 399, 401 quote *Sn.* 1042 with the opening line reading differently<sup>24</sup> and refer to the *Metteyyapañha* of the *Pārāyana*. At *A.* IV. 63 the female lay-devotee Nandamātā is reported as reciting the *Pārāyana* with proper intonation (*sareṇa*) and Vessavaṇa is pleased with it. *Sn.* 1064 is quoted at *Kvu.* 94; *Sn.* 1117 at *Ap.* 537, 25; *Sn.* 1118-1119 at *Ap.* 537, 26-28;

23. Also Vide § III; Anesaki, J.P.T.S. 1906-7 p. 51, mentions that no less than 13 references are made to it in early texts.

24. *Sn.* 1042a reads, so ubhantaṃ abhiññāya, while the line at *A.* III. 399 reads, yo ubhante viditvāna.



*Sn.* 1119 at *Vsm.* 656 and *Kvu.* 64; besides the numerous instances where the verses of the *Pārāyana* are quoted in Commentaries and quoted and commented on in *Nettipakaraṇa*.<sup>25</sup>

Among the references in BSk. works<sup>26</sup> many of the following have already been mentioned in connection with the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*. *Divy.* 20, 34, include it among the texts recited by Śroṇa and the merchants respectively. The *Dulva* too mentions it in the episode of Śroṇa. The *Vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins (Ch. Tok. XVI. 4. 56a) mentions *Po-lo-yen* (*Pārāyana*) as one of the texts recited by him, and includes it among the "great suttas" in a passage which is important for the history of the Canon. *Po-lo-yen* (The Way Across) is the 16th passage out of the 18 mentioned. The *Arthavargīyasūtra* is No. 17, and the majority of the other passages is from *D*. In a list of *sūtras* "which should be taught to novices" occurring in the *Vinaya* of the Mahāsaṅghikas (Ch. Tok. XV. 8. 9. 3a) the *Pa-ch'ung-ching* (*Aṭṭhaka Vagga*) and *Po-lo-yen* are mentioned at the head. The *Vinaya* of the Dharmaguptakas (chap. 54) too refers to the *Pārāyana*. Reference to it is also made in *Abhidharmamahāvibhāṣā* (chap. 4), where it is stated that the *Pārāyana* was recited at a "Council" of 500 arhats held under Kaniska's patronage. Some of the passages specially cited are the second stanza of *Posālamāṇavapucchā* and *Sn.* 874. *Mahāprajñāpāramitā Śāstra* in its first chapter quotes the "Question of Mākandika" in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* (*Sn.* 837-840 are quoted), and in chapter 3 "The Question of Ajita in the *Pārāyana*" (*Sn.* 1032 ff.). Aśvaghoṣa refers to the brāhmaṇas of the *Pārāyana* in his *Buddhacarita* (v. 1061) and *Sūtrālaṅkāra* (canto 43). E. J. Thomas (*Life of Buddha*, p. 274) mentions the story of Bāvarī in a later form found among the MSS. discovered in Central Asia and cites Sieg und Siegling, "Tocharische Sprachreste" I, p. 101.

From all these references, specially those in the Pāli Canon, which are older than the BSk. works, it is evident that the *Pārāyana* existed very early as a separate collection. Nowhere is *Sn.* mentioned when quotations are made from various *pañhas*. This is further proof that the *Pārāyana*, like the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* goes back to a period prior to the compilation of *Sn.* The various quotations also show that the questions of the *Pārāyana* have not undergone the rigid classification and arrangement found later in *Sn.* They are invariably called *pañhas* and not *pucchās* unlike in *Sn.*

W. Stede (*Nd* 2, p. xx) suggests that these *pañhas* may have existed in "some arrangement other than that which enumerates them simply as *Pucchās* 1, 2, etc." By carefully analysing the various MSS. of *Nd* 2 he notes that the *Niddesa* makes it "conclusive to a certain extent that groups

25. Vide Otto Franke and E.M. Hare, *ibid.*

26. *Op. cit.* (Sylvain Lévi).

of *pucchās* existed separately before they were set in the present arrangement, or were taken out of their present setting because they were greater favourites than others.' The popularity of the *Ajita Sutta* perhaps led to its being placed at the head of the *vagga*. *Metteyya* and *Puṇṇaka Pañhas* can be considered to have been equally popular, judging from the quotations made from them in Pāli works; and this probably explains their position as second and third respectively in the *vagga*. *Udaya Pañha* is also quoted from, but it is placed as No. 13. Stede concludes that either of Nos. 3 and 4 may have formed the last *sutta* of a separate group.

It is generally accepted that *Nd 2* is older than *Sn*. The latter does not yield any information regarding the arrangement of these *pucchās*. All the 16 pieces are called *Pucchās*, whereas in *Nd 2* some are called *suttas*; (*viz.* Nos. 1 and 3, and the others are called *pañhas*). The minor variations in the mode of referring to and commenting on these pieces in *Nd 2* may shed some light on this question. Stede<sup>27</sup> shows that *Nd 2* is uniform as regards the concluding statements in the Commentaries of the *suttas* up to No. 3; e.g. *Ajita Sutta Niddeso samatto*, etc. that Nos. 4 and 5 are numbered after the comments on them (e.g. *Mettagu pañham catuttham samattam*, etc.), and that the numeration ceases after No. 5. He questions whether Nos. 1-5 formed one separate collection. It is quite probable that Nos. 1-3 formed one collection and that Nos. 1-5 another, so that the group Nos. 1-3 was either included in the bigger group Nos. 1-5, or the earlier group was Nos. 1-3 which was later extended up to No. 5. It is quite obvious that Nos. 6-16 formed a group or groups independent of Nos. 1-5. The position of the popular *Udaya Pañha* as No. 13 may suggest that it may have been placed at the head of another group consisting of Nos. 13-16 just as the well-known *Ajita Pañha* was placed at the head of the earlier group (Nos. 1-3 or 1-5). The probability is that Nos. 6-16 consisted of two groups *viz.* Nos. 6-12 and 13-16. All these pieces were, at a subsequent date, taken together and gradually worked out into a legend by introducing Bāravī, the brahmin of the South.

## 28

### The Vatthu Gāthā

The legend of Bāvarī leads to the question of the relationship of the *vatthu-gāthā* and the epilogue to the *pucchās* of the *Pārāyana*. The *Niddesa* leaves the *vatthu-gāthā* (*v.g.*) uncommented and it is doubtful whether they were known to its author. In some MSS. of *Nd 2* (*vide Nd 2 introduction*)

27: *Ibid* p. xxi.



the text of the v.g. and that of the epilogue is to be met with, while in others only that of v.g. The inclusion of the v.g. and the epilogue in MSS. of *Nd* 2 does not help one to determine whether the author was acquainted with these two pieces, for it may have taken place long after the writing of *Nd* 2. The fact that the v.g. are not commented upon in the work shows *either* that the v.g. did not exist at the time of the writing of *Nd* 2, *or* that they may have existed in some form or other, but were not accepted as authentic by the author. The early occurrence of v.g. in verse is highly doubtful, but it is probable that the versification of an earlier existing prose legend may have taken place somewhere about the same time as the composition of the v.g. of the *Nālaka Sutta*. This introductory prose legend cannot be considered very old, for all the internal evidence of the v.g. and the epilogue shows that these pieces were at least a few centuries younger than the *pucchās*. It is probable that the legend of Bāvarī which was introduced as an *ākhyāna*-narrative by the reciters of these ballads, underwent certain changes and modifications as time went on, and finally became fixed in the present metrical rendering. The outcome is a short *kāvya* in itself in true epic-style.

The opening stanzas easily suggest their kinship with epic literature. A Kosalan brahmin (from Sāvatthi?) comes to the Southern Country (Dakkhiṇāpatha of Deccan) and settles down at Muḷakā (reading with *Nd*. 2 and Chalmers) on the banks of the upper Godhāvarī in the country of the Assakas (Aśmaka), probably not very far from Paṭiṭṭhāna (Pratiṣṭhāna, the modern Paithan about 19.5° N 75° E).<sup>28</sup> Then another brahmin visits him and demands (text, *yācati*—begs, *Sn*. 980d) 500 pieces. When Bāvarī replies that he has no money the other curses. The pronouncement of the curse (*Sn*. 983), its description (*Sn*. 984), the repercussions on Bāvarī (*Sn*. 985), the appearance of the *devatā* (*Sn*. 986) and the conversation that ensues (*Sn*. 987-993) are truly characteristic of epic poetry. There are numerous instances of similar situations in the Sanskrit epics and other literature. The pronouncement of the curse in *Nalopākhyāna* and the gradual *dénouement* of the plot in it could be compared with the legend of Bāvarī. The comparatively later *jātaka* literature affords many parallels. Neumann (*Reden* p. 547) compares *Sn*. 984 with the description of the curse in *Śakuntalā*. The tidings of the Buddha given by the *devatā* cause immense joy in Bāvarī who summons his pupils and bids them visit the Buddha. In reply to their question as to how they would be able to recognize the Buddha, Bāvarī replies that he could be distinguished by the 32 characteristics of a *mahāpurisa* (super-man). He instructs them

28. B.C. Law, in "India as described in the Early Texts of Buddhism and Jainism" pp. 157, 158, 218, tries to establish that this Bāvarī was Pāsenadi's teacher (*Sn*. A. II, 580) and that when he built his hermitage "near the Pancavaṭṭi during Pāsenadi's reign there came into existence a high road connecting Rājagaha and Paṭiṭṭhāna." (*ibid.* p. 219).



not to ask their questions verbally, but merely to think of them, so that the Buddha would give the appropriate answer.

The sixteen brahmins wend their way north through Patitthāna to Māhissati (Māhīṣmatī) south of the river Vetravatī which divides the Maṇḍala of Avantī into north and south, the north having its capital at Ujjenī (modern Ujjain) and the south at Māhīṣmatī,<sup>29</sup> and known as Avanti Dakkhiṇāpatha.<sup>30</sup> From there they proceed to Ujjenī north of the river and to Gonaddha.<sup>31</sup> They continue east to Vedisa known as ‘‘The Forest City’’ (Sn. 1011d, Vanasavhaya, identified by Cunningham with modern Bhīlsa in Gwalior State, 26 miles N.E. of Bhopāl), and then north-east to Kosambi (Kauśāmbī), and next north to Sāketa, Setavya and Sāvatti, the capital of the Kosalas, then eastwards to Kapilavatthu (Kapilavāstu) of the Sākyas, and the city of Kusinārā (Kṛṣṇānagara) of the Mallas, then further north to Pāvā and Bhojanagara in the Malla country in the Himalayan foot-hills and finally south-east to Vesālī of the Magadhas and Pāsāṇaka cetiya near Rājagaha where they meet the Buddha. They are satisfied with the answers to their ‘‘mental’’ questions and salute the Buddha. With the invitation of the Buddha to ask him questions to have their doubts cleared, they begin asking questions one by one.

The *vatthu-gāthā*, as a whole, depict conditions much later than the time of the Buddha, or even the time of the compilation of the *pucchās*. Internal evidence and linguistic data show that they are decidedly later than the *pucchās*. It will be useful to analyse the internal evidence which consists chiefly of a study of the names of places mentioned in the story, the terms and technical expressions used, signs of the growth of the concept Buddha and the doctrinal emphasis. Firstly, the v.g. show intimate knowledge of the Dakkhiṇāpatha, of far-off places like Muḷakā (not identified) and Patitthāna in the land of the Assakās north-western Hyderabad). The road taken by the 16 *māṇavas* was the trade-route running from North to South-East (Sāvatti to Rājagaha).<sup>32</sup> The simile at Sn. 1014b, *mahālābham va vāṇijo* (as a merchant—longs for—great gain) seems to allude to the caravan-men who followed these trade-routes. Even if the first route did exist as early as the time of Pasenadī (according to Sn.A. 580) it cannot be said that Buddhism had spread to these southern regions so early as the time of composition of the *pucchās*. It must have taken a considerable period of time before Buddhism spread to these regions, and places like Māhissati, Ujjenī, Gonaddha and Vedisa were

29. Vide D. R. Bhandarkar, *Carmichael Lectures 1918*, p. 54.

30. B. C. Law, *op. cit.* p. 104.

31. According to B.C. Law (*ibid* p. 74), Māhīṣmatī was later known as Gonaddha. But this is very doubtful and improbable.

32. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, p. 103.



far away from the cradle of Buddhism. A knowledge of these places in the v.g. presupposes a time when Buddhism was known to the people in Dakkhiṇāpatha even if it had not spread there. It is also of interest to note how the brahmins looked upon this region. *Baudhāyana Gṛhya Sūtra* V. 15 considers this region as unholy land.

*Surāṣṭram Sindhu Sauvīram Avantī Dakṣiṇāpatham.*

*Etāni brāhmaṇo gatvā punah saṃskāram arhati.*

(It behoves a brahmin who goes to Surāṣṭra, etc., to perform his sacraments again). cp. *Divy.* 19. It is needless to say that under these conditions Brahmanism could not have spread to these regions very early. If that was so it is difficult to explain how Bāvarī a brahmin, and other brahmins mentioned in the v.g. could find their way here to a land so far south, even to the furthest limits of the unholy land. If Bāvarī was a historical figure he must have lived at a time when the brahmins had begun to consider the Dakkhiṇāpatha no longer as unholy land. This fact and the knowledge of the trade-route to the south-west suggest that the v.g. reflect a period when Dakkhiṇāpatha was well-known to Buddhist writers. The first time that this region is expected, with some degree of certainty, to have come under the influence of Buddhism, is during the reign of Asoka when he sent out his missionaries far and wide, Mahādeva was sent to Mahisamandala and Rakkhita to Vanavāsa (cp. *Vedisam Vanasavhayam* both presumably in Dakkhiṇāpatha. (*Mhv.* 12, 3-4).

The terms and technical expressions used in the v.g. point to a comparatively late period. The use of the words *visaya* (in *Assakassa visaye*—*Sn.* 977a) and *mandira* (in *Kosalamandira*—*Sn.* 996a, and *Kusinārañca mandiram*—*Sn.* 1012d) needs investigation. The word *visaya* in the sense of region, country or kingdom may have had its origin in epic or Classical Sanskrit. It is not used in this meaning in Vedic. The nearest approach to it in old Pāli is to be found in words like *Pettivisaya* or *Yamavisaya* (the realm or domain of Petas and Yama respectively). This usage in the v.g. appears late. The word *mandira* is frequently found in late Sk. in the sense of house or mansion, as in Pāli. Here it apparently stands for a political or regional division. If these regions were independent kingdoms (or cities as in the case of the latter) they would rather be referred to as *desa* or *raṭṭha*, or *nagara* or *rājadhāni*. It is probable that these two *mandiras* were two of many such *mandiras* within a large empire. Such an empire came into existence for the first time in India's history under Candragupta (322-298 B.C.)<sup>33</sup> and the next great empire was that of Asoka (272-232 B.C.)<sup>33</sup>. It may then be possible that the v.g. were written at least after the time of Candragupta. (Other available evidence tends to show that they were of still later date).

33. V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*, p. 206, assigns these dates.



The next point of interest lies in Sn. 1000-1001. The sixteen *mānavas* learn from Bāvarī that the Buddha's distinguishing marks are the 32 characteristics. Here the v.g. present a phase of development in the Buddha-legend, for it is not his teaching that is mentioned, but his outward marks. Sn. 1001 dogmatically states that there are two, and only two, courses of action open to a being who has these 32 marks on his body. This is further proof of a gradual crystallization that has set in. There are a few epithets used in the v.g., e.g. *sambuddho* (7 times),<sup>34</sup> *sabbadhammānapāragū* (Sn. 992b), *pabhaṅkara* (Sn. 991d), *vivattacchadda* (Sn. 1003c) and *anāvaraṇadassāvī*, among others at Sn. 991, 992, 995, 996, 1003, etc., but the majority of them are found in the older parts of the prose *Nikāyas* as well.

The phrase *pubbevāsanavāsītā* (Sn. 1009d) 'impressed with the resultant force of their former deeds'<sup>35</sup> too sheds some light on the date of the v.g. The doctrine of *vāsanā* is apparently alien to early Buddhism, though the same idea may be found in germinal form in phrases like *pubbe kaṭaṇi kammaṃ* (actions done in the past). The developed idea as such is to be seen at *Miln.* 10, *pubbe vāsanāya coditahadayo* (his heart impelled by former impressions); *Miln.* 263, *pubbevāsītavāsanā* (cp. Sn. 1009d), and *Vism.* 185, *katasamaṇadhammo*, *vāsītavāsano*, *bhāvitabhāvano* (he who has discharged the obligations of a recluse, has the resultant force of his former deeds impressed on him and has developed his meditations). *Vāsanā* is often mentioned in *Nettipakaraṇa* where it occurs no less than 12 times,<sup>36</sup> in a slightly different sense though fundamentally the same. Some *suttas* here are called *vāsanābhāgiya* (pertaining to v.). All the works in which this term is employed reflecting on an accepted theory of *vāsanā*, are comparatively late. Of them the date of *Vism.* is to some extent certain; i.e. 5th century A.C. Hardy limits the date of *Nett.* between 2nd century B.C. and 5th century A.C. though he is more inclined to favour a date in the neighbourhood of the latter limit.<sup>37</sup> Mrs. Rhys Davids in her *Milinda Questions* suggests a date towards the beginning of the Christian Era to *Miln.*; and in her *Outlines of Buddhism* p. 103, she assigns the date 80 B.C. These instances show that all the other references to *vāsanā* do not go back earlier than 2nd century B.C. This fact may, to some extent, help in determining the date of the v.g. All these references to *vāsanā* presuppose the existence of at least, a contemporary belief in 'former impressions'. It has already been noticed that this term does not occur in earlier Pāli works. It is probable that the concept of *pubbe-*

34. This word occurs 7 times in the v.g. and twice in the epilogue, viz. Sn. 992 a, 994 a, 995 f, 998 d, 1003 c, 1016 a, 1031 a, 1145 c, 1147 c. There are 10 other occurrences in Sn.—3 in *Uraga Vagga* and 7 in *Mahā Vagga*.

35. Vide P.T.S. for *vāsanā* and *vāsita*; *vāsanā*=impression (Rhys Davids).

36. Also vide P.T.S., s.v.

37. *Nettipakaraṇa* (P.T.S.) Introduction p. xx.



*vāsanā* was further developed into a fuller theory by the time of the Commentaries. The frequent occurrence of this idea in *Nd 2* is very significant. The concluding passages in the comments on each of the 16 *pucchās* contains one standard phrase in which the word *vāsanā* occurs—(vide *Nd 2*, p. xxiv), *Ye tena brāhmaṇena saddhiṃ ekajjhā ekappayogā, ekādhippāyā, ekavāsanavāgitā*. (They who were together with the brahmin, of similar undertakings, of similar intentions and impressed with similar former impressions).

It has been noticed earlier that either the v.g. did not exist at the time of the compilation of *Nd 2*, or if they did exist in some form or other they were not accepted as authentic by the writer of *Nd 2*. The occurrence of the same idea in both *Nd 2* and the v.g. shows that neither belonged to a period prior to the development of a theory of *vāsanā*. The probability is that both the v.g. and *Nd 2* were not separated from each other by a long interval of time, and that the subject-matter of the v.g. may have existed in some form before *Nd 2* was compiled, and that the latter was influenced by it. This would explain the occurrence of the phrase *ekajjhā*, etc. in *Nd 2* in spite of the fact that the v.g. are left uncommented in it. In the light of the above observations it may be inferred that these references to *vāsanā* do not date back earlier than 2nd century B.C., and that both the v.g. and *Nd 2* which were separated by a short interval of time do not go back earlier than the earliest limits of the period to which *Nett.*, *Miln.* and *Vism.* can be assigned; i.e. 2nd century B.C. As regards the v.g. this is further borne out by linguistic data.

The v.g. contain words and linguistic forms belonging to various periods. There are older forms lying side by side with much younger ones. These older forms are the same as the already existing early *gāthā*-forms and belong to a stratum which is generally called "the *Gāthā*-dialect." They either preserve the *gāthā*-idiom or are borrowings modelled on the language of the *gāthās*. There are numerous instances of younger forms, some betraying a strange resemblance to epic Sanskrit. It also contains highly developed and perhaps Sanskritic idioms and usages. Even though there is a preponderance of older forms, the younger forms show that these *gāthās* should belong to a later period. The idioms, *Assakassa visaye* (*Sn.* 977 a), *vasī Godhāvarī kūle* (*Sn.* 977) are purely Sanskritic. *Tasseva upanissāya* (*Sn.* 978 a) is a peculiar usage, which Bdhgh. comments as *upayogatthe c'etaṃ sāmivacanam, taṃ upanissāyā'ti attho,*" (*Sn. A.* 581). The verb *vācati* (*Sn.* 980d) in the present tense following another in the past (*āgañchi-Sn.* 979 d) is typical of Sk. epic poetry. *Bhavaṃ nānupadassati* (*Sn.* 983b) is again the Sk. idiom though the verb is a historical future form. Other instances of verbs in the present tense following a verb in the past are at *Sn.* 985, *ussussati* and *na ramati* after *āhu* in *Sn.*



984 d. The idiom *bhotī jānāti* (Sn. 988 a) is also Sanskritic. The loc. sg., *asmim* in *asmim puthavimaṇḍale* (Sn. 990 b) is very near Sk. *asmin*, as usually Pāli has *imasmim*. *Puthaulmaṇḍala* as a term referring to the world belongs to late Sk. The words *visaya* and *mandira* have already been discussed. The word *apacca* (Sn. 991c) is seldom used in Pāli although it goes back to Vedic *apatya*; but it is in frequent use in Sk. In spite of the old forms the sufficiently numerous younger forms are ample proof that the language of the v.g. taken as a whole is rather late. This is quite in accord with the overwhelming internal evidence which definitely shows that the v.g. are of no great antiquity.

## 29

It was stated earlier that the *vatthu-gāthā* were meant to introduce the subject but apart from the legendary introduction which has little bearing on the *pañhas* (*pucchās*), the latter are still independent *suttas*. Bāvarī the brahmin, is spoken of as the teacher of the 16 *mānavas*; and in the epilogue Pingiya is represented as singing Buddha's praises in Bāvarī's presence and converting him. This, apparently, is the only connecting link between the legend in the v.g. and epilogue and the *pucchās*. Yet, a rather successful attempt has been made to incorporate in this legendary epic, the *pucchās*, and to establish a connecting thread running through the whole *vagga*. However, one loses all contact with the story of Bāvarī in the *pucchās*. The Buddha is seen answering the eager questions of some would-be followers. Nothing else can be gathered from the *pucchās* about these interlocutors of the Buddha, except what can be seen from their views and philosophical leanings.

The position of the story of Bāvarī in the *Pārāyana* is best summed up in the words of E. J. Thomas, "The *Pārāyana* is indeed old... There is no reason for thinking that this legend in its present form is of the same age as the *Pārāyana*. . . It is evident that even though the legend may be old, the same cannot be said of the details that may have been introduced when it was recast."<sup>38</sup>

## 30

## Uraga Vagga

Proceeding to the other three *vaggas*, the *Uraga Vagga* calls for attention next. It has already been mentioned (U.C.R. VI, 1) that the *Uraga Sutta* which has been placed at the head of the *vagga* has given its name to the

38. *Life of Buddha*, p. 14.

whole section. In many respects the opening *Uraga Sutta* resembles the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta*, but unlike the two *Yakkha*-ballads, *Hemavata* and *Ālavaka Suttas* or *Parābhava* and *Vasala Suttas* which deal with practically the same topic, the two are not placed together in the *vagga*. Both *Uraga* and *Khaggavisāṇa Suttas* are didactic ballads with regular refrains running through them, and dealing with similar topics. Another poem which can be classed in the same category is *Muni Sutta* which resembles the other two in both subject-matter and style though the refrain is confined to only 8 out of its 15 stanzas (i.e. *Sn.* 212-219). All these three *suttas* are archaic in character. Available evidence suggests the independent existence of *Khaggavisāṇa* and *Muni Suttas*, prior to the compilation of *Sn.* The former is commented in *Nd* 2 (as an independent *sutta*) and is quoted in full at *Ap.* I, 8-13 (*Pacceka-buddhāpadāna*) while the latter is mentioned in Asoka's Bhābru Edict as *Muni gāthā*, and in several other instances along with other sections of the Scriptures (*supra*).

*Dhaniya* and *Kasibhāradvāja Suttas* are similar to these three in subject-matter, but form a different type of ballad. They can be grouped together as dialogue-ballads though the latter in reality is a narrative-ballad with the dialogue in mixed prose and verse. In both of them there is a great deal of the dramatic-element; both are didactic to a certain extent and both deal with farmers who eventually became lay-disciples. The former contains highly antithetical alternate verses uttered by *Dhaniya* the herdsman and the *Bhagavā* respectively, while the latter in its main section (*Sn.* 76-81) contains one question by the brahmin and a long answer given by the Buddha in metaphors stating counterparts to some important Buddhist concepts, in the various implements used and actions done in ploughing. In both these *suttas* the Buddha is represented as retracing the very words of the interlocutors giving them a new value and a new twist so that the higher truths of his message are brought within the limited scope of a ploughman's (for herdsman's) terminology. One would normally expect these two *suttas* too to be grouped together like Nos. 6 and 7 and Nos. 9 and 10, on account of their similarities in style and theme and the technique employed in them.

The next poem *Cunda Sutta* differs from the first four *suttas* in theme and general tone. It presupposes a time when some monks were seen leading a life of evil and sin (*Sn.* 89). The gradual crystallisation of ideas regarding the ideal monk (*Sn.* 86) and the motive of preventing the lay *ariyasāvakas* losing their faith in the virtuous monks on account of these evil-doers (*Sn.* 90) show that the poem belonged to an age of developed monasticism. The inclusion of this *sutta* here perhaps serves to connect the four earlier *suttas* of lofty ideals with the three popular *suttas* that follow. The first of these enumerates the causes of man's downfall and



deterioration (*parābhava*), the second details the characteristics of a *vasala* (an out-caste in the strict Buddhist sense), and the third is a treatise on *mettā* (amity). The only characteristic that is common to *Cunda Sutta* and the two that follow it is that all three of them are dialogue-ballads. In the grouping together of the two *suttas*, *Parābhava* and *Vasala* may be seen signs of an attempt at some sort of arrangement of the *suttas*. Although the next *sutta*, *Metta*, is a didactic ballad it shares something in common with the two proceeding *suttas*—all three of them being popular in character and intended for the benefit of both monk and layman. *Metta Sutta* occurs in both *Kh.* (No. IX) and the *Catubhāṇavāra* (*Parittas*), whereas the other two are found repeated in the *Parittas* only.

The next two *suttas*, *Hemavata* and *Ālavaka*, are of high literary merit—both containing the dramatic element to some extent. The fact that they deal with *yakkhas* appears to have been the reason for their being grouped together. The next *sutta* (*Vijaya*) contains a list of the parts of the human body, in poetical form. Placed last in the *vagga* is the old *Muni Sutta*, which probably entered the *vagga* last of all.

Judging from the subject-matter, type of ballad, and the grouping of poems in the *vagga*, it appears that this section now known as the *Uraga Vagga* consisted of only 10 *suttas* at a certain stage; thus:—

Group I, *Suttas* 1-4,

No. 5 separating Groups I and II,

Group II, Nos. 6 and 7,

No. 8 separating Groups II and III,

Group III, Nos. 9 and 10.

This clearly explains the position of the old *Muni Sutta* as the last member of the *vagga*, placed immediately after so late a piece as the *Vijaya Sutta*. In spite of its resemblance to *Khaggavisāṇa* and *Uraga Suttas* in language, style and theme, it has not been grouped with them.

### 31

#### Culla and Mahā Vaggas

The next two sections of *Sn.*, *Culla Vagga* (*Cvg.*) and *Mahā Vagga* (*Mvg.*) consist of 14 and 12 *suttas* respectively. The total number of stanzas comprising the 14 *suttas* of *Cvg.* is a little more than half that of *Mvg.* (i.e. *Cvg.* 183, and *Mvg.* 361). The majority of the *suttas* in *Cvg.* are short pieces whereas those of *Mvg.* are comparatively longer. This perhaps may have been the reason for naming these two sections as *Culla* and

*Mahā Vaggas* respectively. Yet there are exceptions as regards the length of the *suttas* in the two *vaggas*. The most outstanding are *Brāhmaṇa-dhammika Sutta* (No. 7 of Cvg.) consisting of 32 stanzas, *Dhammika Sutta* (No. 14 of Cvg.) consisting of 29 stanzas and *Subhāsita Sutta* (No. 3 of Mvg.) containing only 5 stanzas in addition to the introductory prose. There are 7 *suttas* in Cvg. containing 10 stanzas or less,<sup>39</sup> and 5 containing a number ranging from 17 to 12.<sup>40</sup> The other two are the exceptionally long *suttas* just mentioned. Five *suttas* of Mvg. contain 32 or more stanzas each,<sup>41</sup> in addition to the prose in the majority of them; and the number of stanzas in six others ranges from 20 to 26.<sup>42</sup> The *Subhāsita Sutta* which is exceptionally short for this *vagga* has already been mentioned. It is curious to note that both the long *suttas* in Cvg. are named *Dhammika* and that they occur as seventh and fourteenth members of the *vagga*. The fact that one of them is the last *sutta* of the *vagga*, and that they occur at regular intervals may suggest that they did not originally belong here.

The *suttas* of Cvg. may be classified roughly into two categories: 1. dialogue-ballads and 2. didactic-ballads; but the classification is not complete by itself. On the one hand, all the *suttas* are didactic in some degree or other, but on the other, practically each *sutta* seems to represent a type by itself. *Amagandha* and *Sammāparibbājaniya Suttas* are dialogue-ballads entirely in verse where the interlocutor speaks but once and the Buddha replies with a discourse. An interesting feature is the refrain running through the discourse in both *suttas*. They deal with topics of general interest in all periods of the history of Buddhism. *Kimśīla Sutta* also appears as such a dialogue, although the questioner's name is not mentioned. It is highly didactic and may equally be classed with the pure didactic-ballads.

There are four dialogue-ballads with prose introductions. The first of them, *Mahāmaṅgala Sutta* is highly popular in character, and the second *Sūciloma* is didactic. Both these *suttas* introduce supernatural beings as interlocutors. The former contains a refrain while the latter has none. The next *Vaṅgisa Sutta*, is an ode in the form of a dialogue-ballad. This is the least didactic of all the 14 *suttas* in Cvg.; yet, it is by no means lacking in it. Here the interlocutor plays a more active part than in the other dialogue-ballads of this *vagga*. The last *Dhammika Sutta* is an eulogy of the Buddha followed by a discourse dealing with the *sīlas* and such other topics. There are also four didactic-ballads entirely in verse; viz. *Hiri Dhammacariya*, *Nāvā* and *Uṭṭhāna Suttas*. *Nāvā Sutta* is named after the simile employed in it (Sn. 321) and the other three after their opening

39. Nos. 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

40. Nos. 1, 2, 4, 12 and 13.

41. Nos. 4, 6, 9, 11 (with *vatthu-gāthā*) and 12.

42. Nos. 1, 2, 5, 7, 8 and 10.



words as in the case of *Kimsīla Sutta*. The opening question in *Kimsīla Sutta* can be explained as a *vatthu-gāthā*, although it is not specifically mentioned so as in *Rāhula Sutta*. The *Rāhula Sutta* differs from the above four in that it has two *vatthu-gāthās* consisting of a question and an answer, and ends with a concluding prose sentence. The *Brāhmaṇadhammika Sutta* is essentially didactic in its verse section, but it contains an introductory prose dialogue and concludes with a confession of faith in prose. The opening *Ratana Sutta* cannot be placed in any particular category. It is neither a didactic poem nor a dialogue, but a *paritta* of later date with a good deal of *saccakiriya* (asseveration). The *Culla Vagga* thus presents a confused mass.

It is not quite possible to sift out the *suttas* that were included in the *vagga* subsequent to the formation of a *vagga* as such, or spot out at a glance the *suttas* on which the *vagga* was built later. On the whole, this section as a *vagga* is decidedly later than the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana Vaggas*, and probably later than many *suttas* of the *Uraga Vagga*. As regards individual poems, the occurrence of the two long *suttas* (Nos. 7 and 14) in a section of short (*culla*) *suttas* leads one to the inference that they originally did not belong to this *vagga*. One may be justified in saying that these two were probably either importations to the *vagga* or were in existence in some other collection prior to the formation of *Culla Vagga*. Another *sutta* that appears foreign to the *vagga* is *Ratana Sutta*. From its internal evidence and linguistic data it will be seen that it is a comparatively late poem. This, along with the fact that it occurs at the head of the *vagga* seems to suggest that it need not necessarily have belonged to this *vagga* at the outset. Neither does it follow from this that the *Cvg.* was older than these three *suttas*; and the question of whether the two longer *suttas* belonged to another group of *suttas* (*vagga*) before *Cvg.* came into existence will be discussed later.

## 32

### Mahā Vagga

The *suttas* of the *Mahā Vagga* are a little more uniform in character. The *Pabbajjā*, *Padhāna* and *Nālaka Suttas* are narrative-ballads with occasional dialogue. It has already been noticed that these three *suttas* represent the earliest beginnings of a life of the Buddha in verse (*U.C.R.* Vol. VI, 2). It is established beyond any doubt that the *Nālaka Sutta* is the same as the *Moneya-sūte* of Asoka's Bhābru Edict. An analysis of Nos. 1 and 2 of *Mvg.* shows that they are very old pieces. Sylvain Lévi<sup>43</sup> identifies

43. J. A. 1915. Regarding *Bimbisārapratyudgama* he says, "Le P'in-po-cha-lo-po-lo-cha-k'ia-mo-nan, 'Bimbisāra vient au-devant' est sans doute le *Pabbajjāsutta* du *Sutta Nipāta*." cp. *Mvastu*. II. 198, *Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins*, *Saṅghabheda-vastu* chap. 4: *Vinaya of the Dharmaguptakas*, *Upasampadāvastu* chap. 31.



*Pabbajjā Sutta* as being mentioned in the *Vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins (chap. XXIV) in a passage which refers to other texts as well, which he considers are of great importance for the history of the Canon. Of the other nine *suttas*, eight (except *Salla*, No. 8) are “mixed-ballads.” Seven of them are dialogues. It has been pointed out that No. 3, *Subhāsita Sutta*, is too short for a section of “long” *suttas* (*mahā*). Nos. 4-7, 9 and 10 are uniform in every way. No. 8 is a didactic-ballad deriving its name from the oft-used metaphorical term *salla* occurring in stanza 19 (*Sn.* 592). The *Dvayatānupassanā Sutta* stands as a class by itself in the whole of *Sn.* It conveys the general impression of a late *sutta*. Its position as last in the *vagga*, as in the case of *Ratana Sutta* which is at the head of *Cvg.* seems to strengthen the supposition that it was an additional accretion, though its lateness is not necessarily proved thereby. Evidence for its lateness is to be sought in the *sutta* itself.

The majority of the pieces in *Mvg.* can be called “mixed-ballads” with dialogue; viz. Nos. 3-7, 9 and 10. Six of these, including No. 3, *Subhāsita Sutta*, are best described as “*sutta*-ballads,” i.e. they are discourses in the form of mixed-ballads—and the latter is more in the nature of an exposition (*veyyākaraṇa*), rather than a ballad proper. There are also four such “*sutta*-ballads” in *Cvg.* viz. Nos. 5, 7, 12 and 14, which occur in a regular pattern in the *vagga*. (*Suttas* 5 and 12 resemble each other in outward form: both are short mixed-ballads with dialogue, though fundamentally the latter is an ode followed by a discourse, while the former, a didactic discourse in answer to a question. The pair Nos. 7 and 14 has been discussed at length.) The *suttas* 6 and 13 too resemble each other in many respects, both being entirely in verse. The only difference between the two is that the former is a straight-forward didactic poem while the latter is a didactic discourse in answer to a question; but the two are similar in outward form. The symmetry seen in these three pairs of *suttas* cannot be a mere accident. It seems likely that in building up the *Culla Vagga* these *suttas* have been so placed as to work out a definite pattern.

This leads to the question whether these *suttas* belonged to some other group or *vagga* before *Cvg.* came into existence. If there was any such group some of the *suttas* now found in *Mvg.* should also have been included in it, for, the existence of a section called *Mahā Vagga* without a corresponding *Culla Vagga* is very doubtful.<sup>44</sup> The resemblance of *suttas* 4-7, 9, and 10 of *Mvg.* to the four “mixed-ballads” of *Cvg.* in form and style suggests that they too may have been included in such a group. There is nothing to prevent No. 8 of *Mvg.* being in the same group, for it could

44. Examples of *Mahā* and *Cūla* (*Cūla*) *Vaggas* occurring together in the Canon are too numerous and need no mention here. Vide D.P.P.N., Malalasekera, s.v.



be argued that as No. 9 in *Mvg.* is rather expository in character, No. 8 which is an expository didactic poem should have been placed in front of it as in the present *vagga*. But the greater probability is for the same type of "mixed" dialogue-ballads to be grouped together, like the *pucchās* of the *Pārāyana*. This would mean that the *hypothetical vagga* consisted of *Cvg.* 5, 7, 12 and 14 and *Mvg.* 1-7, 9 and 10.

This reflects no light whatsoever on the question of the age of the *suttas* found in these two *vaggas*. Beyond any reasonable doubt *Moneyya Sutta* (*Nālaka* discourse) could be placed among the oldest *suttas* in *Sn.* The age of the *suttas* does not necessarily determine whether they belonged to a particular group (or groups) or not, for, they can exist independently and be introduced into other collections at subsequent dates; e.g. the old *Muni Sutta*, a comparative new-comer to *Uraga Vagga*. This further justifies the exclusion of old *suttas* like *Pabbajjā*, *Padhāna* and *Nālaka* from the reconstructed group of ballads. Moreover the position of these *suttas* in *Mvg.* indicates that they were probably additions made when two *vaggas* grew in place of a *vagga* of mixed-ballads. (This need not necessarily have belonged to *Sn.*, and its independent existence like the *Pārāyana* or *Atthaka Vagga* is not improbable). *Pabbajjā* and *Padhāna Suttas* were placed at the head of *Mvg.* (and not *Cvg.*) probably on account of their length. The only plausible explanation of the position of the short *Subhāsita Sutta* as the third member of the *vagga* is that it could have occurred in some collection or other together with the preceding *suttas*; but this is highly improbable. As it differs considerably from the "sutta-ballads" it cannot be surmised that it may have occurred immediately before *Sundarikabhāradvāja Sutta* in an earlier group. As regards the *Salla Sutta*, its length and the expository nature of the following (*Vāsetṭha*) *sutta* may have been responsible for its inclusion in the present *Mahā Vagga*, and probably it did not exist together with the others in an earlier group. The *Nālaka Sutta* seems to have been introduced immediately after the regular "mixed-ballads." The chief reason for its inclusion here and not in *Cvg.* is its length. One would normally expect this *sutta* to be placed beside the other two *suttas* which are directly connected with the life of the Buddha. The fact that this is separated from them also suggests that these three *suttas* did not originally belong here, but were introduced after the two groups *Mvg.* and *Cvg.* were formed.

It may also be possible that the three *suttas*, *Pabbajjā*, *Padhāna* and *Nālaka* were earlier found together in one group at a certain stage, and that eight *suttas* were added after the *Padhāna Sutta* to make up the *Mahā Vagga*. The fact that these three *suttas* belong to an early stratum does not necessarily imply that they may have been the only *suttas* of their class. Moreover, *Nālaka Sutta* does not form a continuous narrative

with the other two *suttas*. A comparison with the later BSk. sources, such as *Lal.* which aims at dealing with a continuous life of the Buddha, or *Mvastu*, which contains accounts of incidents connected with his life, shows that these three *suttas* in *Sn.* deal with only three of the numerous incidents reported in later sources. It is quite probable that some *suttas* parallel to those found in *Lal.* and *Mvastu*, were lost and that *Sn.* contains only a partial picture. The fact that only these three are preserved shows that they are but fragments of an earlier stratum brought to light at a subsequent date and included in the group now known as *Mahā Vagga*. It has already been pointed out that their relative position in the *vagga* shows that they are additions made to the *vagga* rather than parts of its framework. From these it is evident that *Mvg.* was not built upon these *suttas* but it grew incorporating them.

It is not possible to determine whether any one of these two *vaggas* was earlier than the other (as a *vagga*). Neither of them is a perfect "finished" chapter. Though the majority of the *suttas* conforms to the designations *Culla* and *Maha*, in length, many exceptions have already been noted. The themes in the "minor" *suttas* (i.e. those in *Cvg.*) are equally lofty as those of the *suttas* in *Mvg.* Therefore the possibility of the two sections being named according to the nature of the themes can be set aside. There is no perfect uniformity in the type of *suttas* in both *vaggas* though as many as six *suttas* of *Mvg.* can be classified as "mixed" dialogue-ballads. The same type of *sutta* is to be seen in *Cvg.* too; viz. Nos. 4, 5, 7, 12 and 14, though the didactic element seems to predominate in them. The commonest type of *sutta* in *Cvg.* is the pure didactic-ballad entirely in verse.<sup>45</sup> but *Mvg.* No. 8 (*Salla Sutta*) too can be said to belong to the same type. The similarity of these two *vaggas* even on this point suggests that they cannot be separated from each other in point of time. Both *vaggas* date back to the same period, and the occurrence of the older *suttas* in *Mvg.* proves nothing beyond the fact that they were incorporated into the *vagga* during the time of its compilation, which perhaps was synchronous with the collation of *Sutta Nipāta* as an anthology.

(Continued)

45. There are seven such *suttas*; viz. Nos. 3, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 13.



# A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUTTA NIPATA

N. A. Jayawickrama

## Additional Abbreviations

Aor.—aorist

Brh. Ār.—*Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad*

Dh.—*Dhammapada* (PTS, 1914)

E./W.Pkr.—Eastern/Western Prakrit

J—*Jātaka* (PTS, 7 vols., 1877-97; reprinted 1962-64)

JA—*Jātaka* Commentary (*ibid.*)

Mbh.—*Mahābhārata*

P.—Pali

PBR—*Pali Buddhist Review*

Pva—*Paramatthadīpanī* (*Petavatthu* Commentary, PTS, 1894)

PtsA—*Saddhammappakāsinī* (*Paṭisambhidāmagga* Commentary, PTS, 3 vols., 1933-47)

S.A.—*Sāratthappakāsinī* (*Samyutta Nikāya* Commentary, PTS, 3 vols., 1929-37)

## THE URAGA SUTTA

33

It is now possible to proceed to the analysis of a few individual *suttas* of the *Sutta Nipāta* with the aid of the criteria detailed earlier. The following analysis is restricted to a proportionately small number of *suttas* and further inferences regarding those that are left out may be drawn on similar lines. Every opportunity will be taken to discuss problems of general application to the whole work under the discussion of these *suttas* so that most of the problems connected with the majority of the *suttas*, will be eventually touched upon. An attempt has been made to make the selection as representative as possible. A few *suttas* from each *vagga* and from each type in the classification on pp. 88-90 in PBR 1, 2, are taken up for analysis. Wherever possible the *suttas* will be discussed in the order in which they occur in *Sn.*, and at the same time those that bear some similarity to one another will be arranged in some order so as to bring out the properties they share in common.

The title *Uraga Sutta* is undoubtedly derived from the simile, *urago jinṇaṃ iva tacam purāṇaṃ* (as a serpent—discards—its old and worn-out slough) in the refrain that runs through the whole length of the poem. Its ability to cast off its slough, an important characteristic of the *uraga*, has been introduced here to describe the action of the *bhikkhu* who renounces both “Here and the Beyond.” There seems to be some mysterious significance attached to this creature which is described as *ura-ga* (lit. belly-crawler). Some *uragas* are considered to belong to a class of semi-divine beings: they are *kāma-rūpī* (*SnA.* 13, capable of changing their form at will). The semi-divine characteristics are usually attributed to *nāgas* rather than to *uragas*. There are numerous instances in the Pāli Canon of *nāgas* changing their form or appearing in disguise. The Commentary (*SnA.*) refers to *Saṅkhapālanāgarājā* in *Saṅkhapāla-jātaka JA.* V. 161-177). At Vinaya I, 86 a *nāga* is said to have received ordination disguised as a young man. An equally mystic significance is associated with the *uraga*’s casting off of the slough. The Commentary (*SnA.* 13-14) describes in detail the four ways in which it does so. *PvA.* 61-62 commenting on *Pv.* I. 12, 1, *urago va tacam jinṇaṃ hitvā gacchati sam tanuṃ* (he goes abandoning his body--corporeal form--as a serpent discards its worn-out slough) says that a serpent casts it off whenever it wishes to do so, as easily as removing a garment, with no attachment to it whatsoever. Here the simile of the serpent’s slough is employed to describe the body at death. The mysterious significance of the *uraga* is more pronounced in a passage occurring at *S.I.* 69. It describes four young creatures (*daharā*) which should not be despised nor abused viz. a *khattiya*, an *uraga*, *aggi* and a *bhikkhu*. A *khattiya* when he becomes king can inflict heavy punishment on man, woman or child that despises him; an *uraga* can sting them; therefore he who holds his life dear should not despise it. Fire with necessary fuel (*upādāna*) can blaze forth into a huge flame and burn them who despise it. The virtuous *bhikkhu* can burn with his flame-like majesty. The *uraga* is also described as, *uccāvacehi vaṇṇchi urago carati tejasi* (v. 1. *tejasā*) in the *Samyutta*: (In diverse appearances<sup>1</sup> the *uraga* roams in its own splendour). It is described here as a mysterious and wonderful creature demanding respect and adoration. The Commentator is silent about the *pāda*, *urago carati tejasi*, and does not confine the quality of *tejas* to *uraga* alone. Fire too possesses the same quality. The *tejas* (splendour or better, power) of the *uraga* is perhaps due to one or more of the following reasons:—

---

1. Cp. Comy. *S.A.* I, 132 *nānāvidhehi saṅghānehi*, etc.



1. Its extraordinary force or strength.
2. Its ability to change at will (*kāmarūpa*).
3. The ease with which it casts off its slough.
4. The fact that it possesses two tongues (*dujivho* cp. J.V. 425 cp. II. 458, and III. 458).
5. Perhaps its ability to live even in fire, like the mythical salamander.<sup>2</sup>

*Uraga* is almost synonymous with *nāga*, a creature equally gifted with miraculous powers and great strength. Some of them are semi-divine. *Nāga* is often used as an epithet for *arahants* and sometimes of the Buddha. Popular etymology explains *nāga* as “*āgum na karoti*” (cp. *Sn.* 522a); and the origin of the epithet is perhaps based on the great power of the *nāga*. The phrase *hatthi-nāga* suggests an equally mystic significance. Yet, it is noteworthy that the word *nāga* is hardly or never used in the Pāli Canon in the same simile of its shedding the slough. Though *sappa*, *ahi*, *āsivisa* and *bhujāṅgama* are synonyms for *uraga*, they fall short of the connotation of the latter term. There is no real magical power attributed to them, unlike the *uraga* or the *nāga*. The last of the four synonyms *bhujāṅgama*, though not in frequent use in canonical Pāli seems to be nearer *uraga* than *ahi*. *Sappa* is treated as a mere poisonous snake in similes. It should be avoided; e.g. *Sn.* 1b, 768b, *Th* 1. 457, and J.V.18. *Āsivisa* is employed in similes to describe *kāma* and similar evil tendencies; e.g. *Th* 2. 451, J. III. 525, cp. 267 and S. IV. 172-174.<sup>3</sup> It is called *uggatejas* at S. IV. 172 ff. and is a synonym for the *mahādhātus*.

## 35

It has already been remarked that the emphasis on *uraga* in the refrain has been the basis of the title *Uraga Sutta*. There are three other *suttas* in *Sn.* named after a simile or metaphor occurring in them; viz. I. 3 (*Khagga-visāṇa*), II. 8 (*Nāvā*) and III. 8 (*Salla*). Over half the number of *suttas* in *Sn.* are named after the interlocutors mentioned in them. There are 36 such *suttas*; viz. *Sn.* I. 2, 4, 5, 9, 10; II. 5, 11, 12, 14; III. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11; IV. 7, 8(?), 9, 16; and V. 2-17. To this may be added I. 7 which is called

2. Here fire and the *uraga* both possess *tejas*. A. K. Coomaraswamy in his *Hinduism and Buddhism* makes out that the Dragon is the sacrificer and the sacrifice, i.e., connected with the smoke coming from the sacrificial altar. Referring to S.B. I. 6.3.14 ff, he attempts to identify the Dragon with the Progenitor. Some such mystical significance may be among the reasons for ascribing *tejas* to the *uraga*.

At Vin. IV. 108 a *nāga* (Vin. I. 24, *nāgarājā*) is described as *iddhimā*: but in each case he was overcome by the (greater) *tejas* of his opponent (Sāgata and the Buddha) cp. J.I. 360. It is also told at AA. I. 324 ff. how Sāgata tamed the fierce *nāgarājā*. (Note by Miss I. B. Horner).

3. Vide Mrs. Rhys Davids: Similes in the Nikāyas, J.P.T.S. 1906, pp. 52 II., 1908 pp. 180 ff.

*Aggikabhāradvāja Sutta* in the Commentary. Of the above list *Pasūra Sutta* is rather doubtful, for *Pasūra* may not be a proper name as Neumann (*Reden* p. 528) suggests. He favours the commentarial gloss *paḷi-sūro* and says that it is *pa-sūra* (*pra-sūra*) like *pācariya* at *M.I.* 509. There are 15 *suttas* named after the topics or themes discussed in them; viz. *Sn.* I. 6, 7, 8, 12; II. 1, 2, 4, 7, 13; III. 1, 2, 12; and IV. 1, 6, 11. To this may be added the alternative names given in the Comy. for I. 11 (*Kāyavicchandaniya*) II. 8 (*Dhamma*), II. 12 (*Nigrodhakappa*), II. 13 (*Muni* or *Mahāsamaya*), III. 4 (*Pūralāsa*) and III. 11 (*Moneyya*). In addition to the six *suttas* mentioned in the note on p. 79 in PBR 1, 2, as being named after their opening words, *Sn.* IV. 10 (*Purābheda*) is named after the opening word of the second stanza (i.e. Buddha's reply). The four *Aṭṭhakas* have already been mentioned (PBR 1, 3, p. 143) to contain in their opening lines the words after which they are named. This makes a total of 11 *suttas* that are named after an opening line. The titles of 9 of these *suttas* (i.e. except *Purābheda* and *Attadaṇḍa*) have direct bearing on the topics discussed in them. The other four *suttas* in *Sn.* viz. I. 11, IV. 12, 13 and 14 are given descriptive titles. It is significant that all the four *suttas* named after a simile occurring in them are pure didactic ballads and all the *suttas* named after persons are dialogue ballads. Those that are named after topics discussed in them belong to various types. There are dialogue ballads like *Vasala* and *Brāhmaṇadhammika Suttas*, didactic poems such as *Muni* and *Kāma Suttas*, narratives like *Pabbajjā* and *Padhāna Suttas* and doctrinal dissertations such as *Dvayatānupassanā Sutta* belonging to this group. All the *suttas*, named after their opening words are didactic poems.

Coming back to the *Uraga Sutta*, the effectiveness of the simile of the serpent's skin may have been one of the reasons for placing this *sutta* at the head of the *vagga*, which in turn derives its name from the former. This is the only *vagga* in *Sn.* which is named after a *sutta*. However, the practice of naming *vaggas* after *suttas* is not rare in other parts of the Canon. There are two *Yodhājīva Suttas* occurring in the *Pañcaka Nipāta* of the *Anguttara*, viz. III 89 ff. and 93 ff., and the *vagga* in which they occur is called *Yodhājīva* (III. 84-110). Similarly, the second *vagga* in the *Majjhima*, *Sīhanāda*, I. 63-122) is named after the two opening *suttas* *Cūlasīhanāda* and *Mahāsīhanāda* (Nos. 11 and 12) and the eleventh *vagga* (*Devadaha*, II. 214-226, III. 1-24) derives its name from the opening *Devadaha Sutta* (No. 101). In such instances as these it need not be the opening *sutta* that is always responsible for the name of the *vagga*. In the *Udāna*, the third *vagga*, (*Nanda*, *Ud.* 21-33) derives its name from the second *udāna* in it, its fifth *vagga* *Soṇatthera*, *Ud.* 47-61) from its sixth member, its sixth *vagga* (*Jaccandha*, *Ud.* 62-73) from the simile in the fourth piece in it, and the last *vagga* (*Pāṭaligāma*, *Ud.* 80-93) from the sixth



*udāna* in it. The first two *vaggas* of *Pv.* are named after their concluding members. *Uragapetavatthu* and *Ubbaripetavatthu* respectively. Of them the *Uraga Vagga* is of special interest here. The first verse of the *vatthu* at *Pv.* 11 (I. 12. 1) contains the simile of the serpent's worn-out slough, and this is the only reason for naming the *vatthu* and the *vagga*, *Uraga*. The Comy. associates this *vatthu* with an *uraga* (serpent) which was responsible for the death of the individual referred to in the story. The illustrative story in the Comy. is the same as that at *J.* III. 162-168, which also contains the text at *Pv.* I. 12 in full.

The simile of the snake casting off its slough seems to be rather popular in Pāli verse. The line at *Pv.* I. 12<sup>1</sup> is also found at *Ap.* 394, 13. In *Mora Jātaka* (*J.* IV. 341) the hunter renounces his career as a hunter even as a serpent discards its old worn-out skin (*tucam va jiṇṇam urago purāṇam*). *Pv.* IX. 28 contains the same line. This simile is also employed to describe how Fortune keeps the fool at bay at *J.* V. 100 and VI. 361:

*Sirī jahati dummedham jiṇṇam va urago tucam*

## 36

The 17 stanzas of the text describe the *bhikkhu* who overcomes anger, lust, craving, arrogance, hatred, doubts and perplexities and other impediments, has found no essence (*sāra*) in all forms of being, sees everything as void being free from covetousness, passion, malevolence and delusion, has eradicated all evil tendencies with no leanings whatsoever towards them, is free from all such qualities which form the basis for earthly existence, and has destroyed all obstacles. He verily is "the *bhikkhu* who shuns both Here and the Beyond as a serpent its old and worn-out skin."

The tone of the *sutta* is generally archaic and the language preserves an early stratum of Pāli. The words and forms of interest are:—**Oraparam** (*Sn.* 1c-17c), a simple *dvandva* cpd. meaning "here below -cp. Sk. *avara*-and the beyond," cp. *parovaram* (*Sn.* 353, etc.). The *ora* and the *pāra* are the limitations (*sīma*) to a true *bhikkhu*. If he wishes to go beyond them (*sīmātigo*, cp. *Sn.* 795a) he should rid himself of all obstacles and leanings which act as causes (lit. causal antecedents) for his downfall (cp. *Sn.* 15b). The concept *ora* has already been noted (PBR 1, 3, pp. 147-8) as being the opposite of *pāra*; but *pāra* in this context is quite different from that of the *Pārāyana* and other places in *Sn.* Here it merely denotes birth in other existences whereas elsewhere (*loc. cit.*) it is almost a synonym for *nibbāna*. **Udacchida** (*Sn.* 2a, 3a) cp. Sk. *ud-a-chid-at*; augmented radical Aor. 3 sg. cp. Vedic. The change *-a+ch->-acch-* is due to

metrical reasons and for preservation of quantity. This is a pure *gāthā*-form not met with in canonical prose. There are four other such augmented radical Aor. forms in this *sutta*: viz. *udabbadhī* (Sn. 4a), *ajjhagamā* (Sn. 5a), *accagamā* (Sn. 8b) and *accasārī* (Sn. 8a-13a). This type of Aor. is very frequent in Sn. and other old (*gāthā*-Pāli).<sup>4</sup> *Udabbadhī* is usually explained as being formed from *ud*+√*vadh* cp. *udavadhīt*. It is probable that this verb is associated with *ud*+√*vṛh*, *br̥ṇhati*, to tear, cp. A.V. *abarhīt* and Bṛh. Ār. *avṛkṣat*, P. *udabbahe* (Sn. 583b, opt. 3. sg.) and *abbahi* (Aor. 3 sg.) in the phrase *abbahi vata me sallam* used frequently in Th 1 and Th 2. The probable development of *udabbadhī* from *ud*+√*vṛh* is as follows:—Vedic *udabarhīt* *ud-a*+*v/b* (*v*. in *vṛh*)>P. *udabb-*: Vedic *-h*>P. *-dh-* cp. Vc. *iha*>P. *idha*. It may be possible that this form is the result of a contamination of the two roots *vadh* and *vṛh* but either of the two can give this form directly and makes the explanation of a contamination superfluous. *Ajjhagamā* (*adhi-a-gam-at*) and *Accagamā* (*ati-a-gam-at*) cp. *abbhidā* (J. I. 247), *āsadā* (Th 1.774), *acchidā* (Sn. 357c) and *udacchidā* (*supra*). *Accasārī* (occurring in both *nāccasārī* and *paccasārī*) *ati-a-sār-īt*, from √*sr*, *sarati*. Neumann (*Reden*, p. 406) suggests *atyasmārī* and *pratyasmārī*, but the explanation in the Comy., *na atidhāvi* and *na ohiyi* is preferable. *Samūhatāse* (Sn. 14b) cp. *paccayāse* (Sn. 15b), double Vc. nom. pl. from *-āsas*>*-āso*>*-āse*; *-o*>*-e* is a dialectical variation influenced by E. Pkr. (Māgadhī). This double nom. with Māgadhī *-e* is rather frequent in early Pāli poetry. In Sn. alone it is seen to occur 20 times, 10 of which are in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*. Neumann (*Reden*, p. 407) says that such forms as *samūhatāse* are not “Māgadhisms” but periphrastic perfects; *samūhata*+*āse*. It would be rather straining to construe a perfect in such contexts as these, and his suggestion, however useful, is not tenable. *Hetukappā*—“which act as a cause” (Sn. 16b). The cpd. appears to be dialectical and nearer the older language, cp. *khaggavisāṇa-kappo* “resembling a rhinoceros” (Sn. 35d-75d).

## 37

The *Uraga Sutta* is written in a metre described as *Aupachandasaka* by Helmer Smith (SnA. 463). The regular *Aupacchandāsika* metre differs from the *Vaitālīya* which consists of two half verses with 30 *morae* each, in that it has an extra long syllable added to each line of 14 and 16 *morae* respectively in the *Vaitālīya*. The metre of these stanzas is rather irregular. The number of *morae* in the first half-verse varies from 32 to 36, but the average seems to be 33, as in the case of the common second half of all these stanzas. The extra syllables in the longer lines may be explained

4. Vide Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, 159 ff.



as *anacrusis*. Helmer Smith (*ibid.*) further notes *pādas* Sn. 6b, 7a, 8a-13a and 14b as irregular. Though this metre is similar to *Aupacchandāsika* which became fixed in the Classical period of Sanskrit literature this particular rhythm cannot be considered so late as that, for it may have been in use long before a metre as such came to be fixed.

Another noticeable feature here, as well as in all Pāli poetry is the apparent disregard of metrical rules. This probably may be the result of the composers being guided more by the ear (rhythm) than by such artificial means as fixed metres. Moreover, in all popular poetry metrical rules are not strictly observed. However, the beat and rhythm of these lines resemble those of dance metres which are usually free and easy metres not subject to artificial regulations.

The style of this *sutta* has already been commented upon. It is a ballad in every respect, though it is used for a didactic purpose. The purpose of the refrain in lines cd in each stanza is to lay emphasis on the central theme. There is a refrain in the initial line and the greater part of the second line of stanzas 8-13,

*Yo nāccasārī na paccasārī  
sabbam vitatham idaṃ ti vīta—*

There is perfect antithesis in the two halves of all these stanzas. Invariably the stanza begins with *yo* and the second half with *so bhikkhu*. In spite of this and the lucidity of diction there is no poetic extravagance which characterises later compositions. Popular similes are freely used to describe the *bhikkhu* who leads a life in accordance with Buddhist ethics. Neumann (*Reden*, p. 408) points out a few parallels in *Mbh.* and other early literature, viz. *jīrṇaṃ ivacam sarpa ivāvamucya* (*Mbh.* V. 39, 2; cp. XII. 250, 11) and *yathā pādodaras tvacā vinirmucyate* (*Praśnopaniṣad*, 5, 5; also *vide Brh. Ār.* IV. 4.10). Other similes are at Sn. 1b, 2b, 4b, (compared by Neumann with *Rgveda* I, 32, 8) and 5b.

There is nothing extraordinary in thought and ideology in the *sutta*. The emphasis is on the conduct of the *bhikkhu*. It is noteworthy that there are 80 references to *bhikkhu* in the *gāthās* of Sn. (in addition to over 15 in the prose), 77 to *muni* (24 of which refer to the Buddha) and over 40 to *samaṇa*, at least 17 of which are used without any specific reference to a Buddhist *samaṇa*. The *Saṅgha* is mentioned 8 times in the *Ratana Sutta* and 4 times elsewhere in both prose and verse. All the references to *bhikkhu*, *muni* and *samaṇa* amply justify Fausböll's statement "we see here a picture not of life in monasteries but the life of hermits in its first stage."<sup>5</sup> The *Uraga Sutta* like *Tuvaṭṭaka* and *Sammāparibbājaniya Suttas* is a splendid

5. His translation of the *Sutta Nipāta*, p. xii (SBE, vol x).

example of a poem that describes the true *bhikkhu* just as *Muni Sutta* describes the *muni*.

The few technical expressions used indicate a phase of development in the doctrine. The terms *ora* and *orapāraṃ* have already been discussed. The terms *kodha*, *rāga*, *taṇhā*, *māna bhavesu sāra* (cp. *bhavataṇhā*), *kopa* and *vitakka* (*Sn.* 1-7) have not undergone the later systematization and arrangement in groups. Usually the three *rāga*, *dosa* and *moha* occur in one group in the more systematised texts and are called the three *akusala-mūlāni* (fundamental blemishes of character). At some places *kodha* and *upanāha* are added to these three, while at others *kilesa* and *kodha* and still others *māna* together with or without *diṭṭhi*. Similarly the occurrence of *papañca*, *vitathā*, *lobha*, *rāga*, *dosa* and *moha* in *Sn.* 8-13 seems to presuppose a time prior to the scholastic classification of the three *akusala-mūlāni* as *rāga/lobha*, *dosa* and *moha*. Besides *Sn.* 14 seems to associate *mūlā akusalā* with *anusaya*.

On the other hand the technical significance of *daratha* and *vanatha* (*Sn.* 15 and 16 respectively), the mention of *pañca nivarana* (*Sn.* 17), and the emphasis on *imaṃ papañcaṃ* (*Sn.* 8) seem to suggest a development in terminology. These are the only references to them, in the form as they are, in this work, though *Sn.* 514d mentions the *nīvaraṇāni* and *Sn.* 66a the *pañcāvaraṇāni*. This seemingly developed terminology may probably point out that this *sutta* presupposes a time when some form of systematization and arrangement has just set in. Another interesting word is *itibhavābhavataṃ* (*Sn.* 6) which is translated by Fausböll as 'reiterated existence' and by Neumann as 'being and non-being'. The explanation in the Comy. (*Sn.* A 20), *sampallivipatti-vuddhīhāni-sassatuccheda-puñña-pāpavasena iti anekappakāra bhavābhavatā* does not make it clear at all. It seems to be somewhat different from *bhavābhava* which occurs in 8 other places in *Sn.*<sup>6</sup> in the sense of 'reiterated existence' or re-birth. Its meaning in this context is apparently nearer the idea of the fluctuating changes of fortune in the course of re-birth. The term is not strictly technical.

An examination of *Uraga Sutta* in the various aspects of language, metre, style, doctrine and ideology shows that it is a comparatively old *sutta*. The lack of linguistic forms that may be classed as late and the presence of old Vedic and dialectical forms suggest that the *sutta* preserves an old stratum of Pāli. The syntax of the stanzas is also simple. The flexibility of metre also suggests an early date for the *sutta*. The lucid and simple style which is by no means heavy or laboured is characteristic of old poetry. The doctrinal emphasis too speaks of an early date for the *sutta*; and the

6. *Sn.* 496b, 776d, 786d, 810b, 877d, 901d, 1,060b and 1,068d.



few technical expressions reflect the “germs of a philosophical system which came to be more logically and consistently systematised”<sup>7</sup> later on. Nothing could be gleaned regarding the social conditions of the time from this *sutta*; all other available evidence points to an early date.

## THE KHAGGAVISĀṆA SUTTA

38

This *sutta* like the *Uraga Sutta* derives its name from the simile used in the refrain.

*eko care khaggavisāṇakappo*

(let him wander alone like a rhinoceros). The lonely habits of the rhinoceros are symbolic of the solitary wanderings of the ascetic—*muni*. Rhinoceroses like elephants expelled from the herd are known to lead a solitary life. Yet, there seems to be some disagreement about the title which is often rendered as “The Horn of the Rhinoceros” following the explanation in the Comy., *ettha khaggavisāṇaṃ nāma khaggamiga-siṅgaṃ* (*khaggavisāṇa* in this context means the horn of the rhinoceros—*SnA*. 65). This explanation may be accepted on the mere coincidence that both species of the rhinoceros seen in India, viz. the “Indian” and the “Javanese” possess only one horn,<sup>8</sup> and that the animal itself is called *khagga* in Pāli and *khadga* in Classical Sanskrit. The explanation of *khaggavisāṇakappo* at *Nd2*. 129, *yathā khaggassa nāma visāṇaṃ ekaṃ hoti adutiyaṃ*.. (just as a rhinoceros possesses only one horn and not a second...) also justifies the explanation in the Comy. In spite of all this the simile would be considered more apt if the life of the lone-sojourner was compared with the lonely habits of the rhinoceros than with its single horn.

In other places in the Pāli Canon the idea of wandering alone is compared with the movements of animals of solitary habits rather than with parts of their anatomy. The simile employed at *J*. II. 220 is with reference to an elephant that wanders alone—*gajam iva ekacāriṇaṃ*. The simile, *eko care mātaṅga-arañṇe va nāgo* (let one wander alone as an elephant in the forest frequented by *mātaṅga*-elephants) at *M*. III. 154, *Dh*. 329, 330 and *J*. III. 488 cp. V. 190 too makes it clear. The similes, *migo arañṇamhi yathā abaddho yenicchakaṃ gacchati gocarāya* (as an untethered deer in the forest-glade roams at will for pasture) at *Sn*. 39ab, and *nāgo va yūthāni vivajjayitvā* (as an elephant that forsakes the herds) at *Sn*. 53a can be compared with that in the refrain. It will be clear from these examples

7. B. C. Law, *History of Pali Literature*, Vol. I, p. 239.

8. *Sub voce* Encyclopaedia Britannica.

that the point of contact of the comparison is an action (i.e. the wandering—*cariyā*) and not an object. Moreover, even in the similes employed in the poem where inanimate objects are compared it is rather some action that stands for comparison than those objects; e.g. *vamsākalāro va asajjamāno* (like a bamboo-shoot *not clinging* to anything) at Sn. 38c, *samsīṇapatto yathā kovīlāro* (like a *kovīlāra* tree with its *scattered-* leaves) at Sn. 44b, *aggī va dadḍham anivattamāno* (like fire *not returning* where it had burnt) at Sn. 62c and *sañchinnapatto yathā pārīchatto*<sup>9</sup> (as a *pārīchatta* tree with its *leaves cut off*) at Sn. 64b.

From these examples it is rather convincing that the point of contact in the simile of the *khaggavisāṇa* is not *khaggassa visāṇa* (rh.'s horn) nor the *cariyā* (movement) of the *visāṇa* (horn) of the *khagga*; but the *cariyā* of the *khaggavisāṇa*, the sword-horn (the rhinoceros) itself. It is quite probable that the rhinoceros was known in earlier Pāli as *khaggavisāṇa*—that which possesses a sword-like horn<sup>10</sup> and that the term *khagga* came into usage later on. This is further testified by the few comparatively late passages in which the animal is called *khagga* viz. Nd2. 129, SnA. 65, JV. 406, 416, VI. 277 and 538. It would therefore, be more correct to interpret the word *khaggavisāṇa* as “rhinoceros” and not “rhinoceros’ horn”.

## 39

The *sutta* on the whole deals with a life of solitude. It advocates the cessation from attachment to family life, friends and companions and society in general. The refrain *eko care* is employed to exhort one to adopt a life of solitude. The idea so colourfully painted in the simile is stressed over and over again in other similes.<sup>11</sup> All the stanzas are connected with the central theme, yet in certain places the connecting thread appears rather thin. A few apparent repetitions and the interruption of the logical trend seem to suggest that the present *sutta* is an enlarged version of an earlier nucleus. It is of interest here to note that the *Khaggavisāṇa Gāthā* at *Mvastu*. I. 357, consist of only 12 stanzas. A comparison of the two versions shows that both deal with the same topic and that the BSk. *sūtra*, though short, discusses the question of solitude as fully as the Pāli version with all its digressions and apparent contradictions. While the central idea of the Pāli *sutta* is the giving up of friends and companions, sons and household life and all forms of *samsagga* and *santhava* (ties and attachments), there are occasional references to an “ideal companion”<sup>12</sup> an idea which appears to be an importation to the

9. Cp. *Mvastu*. I. 258, *samsīṇa-patro* (with scattered-leaves).

10. Cp. English, horn-bill, sword-fish, etc.

11. At Sn. 38, 39, 44, 46, 53, 62, 64, 71 and 72.

12. At Sn. 45, 47 and 58.



original *sutta*. There is also other extraneous matter such as the mention made of certain recluses (*paribbājakas*?) who are virtually householders (*Sn.* 43ab), the reference to the theory of *mettā* at *Sn.* 42a and the four items of the *brahma-vihāras* at *Sn.* 73, a digression on *kāma* and other *upaddavas* (hindrances) at *Sn.* 50-56—though the stanzas conform to the central theme, the repetition of the idea at *Sn.* 46 in different words at *Sn.* 57 thus re-introducing the topic of *mittam ulāram* (a noble companion), and the introduction of a complete list of Buddhist terms at *Sn.* 60. Besides these, there are numerous repetitions of ideas and wholesale lines and phrases.

The 12 stanzas in *Mvastu*. roughly correspond to 7 stanzas in *Sn.* in the following manner:—St. 1//*Sn.* 68, st. 2//*Sn.* 73, st. 3abd//*Sn.* 35abd, st. 3c// ? *Sn.* st. 4// *Sn.* 64, st. 5abd// *Sn.* 62abd, st. 5c// *Sn.* 64c, stt. 6abd-10abd // *Sn.* 36abd, (st. 6c//? *Sn.* 36c. st. 7c//? *Sn.* 37c, st. 8c// *Sn.* 41c, st. 9c//? *Sn.* 37b, st. 10c//? *Sn.* 36c), st. 11abd// *Sn.* 37abd, st. 11c// *Sn.* 35c. and st. 11=st. 12 with *jñātī* for *putram* in line c. This table is not quite complete, for there are many words in the two versions which are quite different in their corresponding lines. Stt. 6-10 are mere repetitions of the same idea with a different word in line c. in each stanza. In the 12 stanzas of the *Khadgaviṣāṇa Gāthā* could be seen the theme of the Pāli *sutta* fully discussed and developed, and likewise the seven corresponding stanzas in the Pāli deal with the topic to a satisfactory degree. The rest of the stanzas express the same ideas in different words dwelling on the theme at length.

There is an apparent contradiction in *Sn.* 45 when it mentions a *nipakam saḥāyam* as contrasted with *na puttam iccheyya kuto saḥāyam* (*Sn.* 35c, cp. *Sn.* 37, 40 and 41). This *kalyāṇa mitta*, as other texts would have it, is not to be categorised as a *santhava*, according to the *sutta*. The same idea is reflected at *Sn.* 94, 185, 187, 254 and 255; and *Sn.* 338 in *Rāhula Sutta* makes specific mention of *kalyāṇa mitta*. It is interesting to note that this topic is discussed at two different places in the *sutta* (viz. *Sn.* 45-47 and *Sn.* 57-58). This shows that either the intervening stanzas were interpolated at a certain stage or *Sn.* 47 marks the end of the section dealing with *mitta* and that *Sn.* 57-58 were added later. (The concluding stanza too makes a casual reference to this type of “noble companion”). The internal evidence of the *sutta* does not necessarily warrant such a conclusion if the criticism is based on linguistic data and other evidence alone. The *sutta* differentiates between two kinds of friends those in the household life; e.g. *Sn.* 40-41 and those in the *brahma-cariyā*; e.g. *Sn.* 45, 47, 50. Perhaps it is possible that the “friends in *brahma-cariyā*” is an allusion to the *ācariya-antevāsika* and *upajjhāya-saddhivihārika* relation-

ships in monastic life. The insistence on a life devoid of any associates was perhaps felt to be too exacting and therefore a compromise was reached by putting forward the "ideal companion"<sup>13</sup> A. K. Coomaraswamy (H. O. S. Miscellany of Pāli Terms, s.v.) equates *kalyaṇamitta* to *mahittma* or *mahatta*; but this is not very convincing. The uniformity of the language of these stanzas and the absence of other evidence prevents one from classing some verses to be earlier or later than the rest. It may be only *probable* that the stanzas in *Mvastu.* preserve an older version, though both Pāli and BSk. may be traced to an older source which is now lost.

It is also noticeable, from the repetitions in stanzas 6-10 and 11-12 (in *Mvastu.*) that the version there is also an enlargement of an earlier *sūtra* but it seems, on the whole, to represent an earlier stratum than the Pāli, though the latter will be seen later to be considerably old. The possibility of the BSk. being a condensed version of an earlier *sūtra* is out of the question for as a rule, no such tendency could be observed in BSk. works, and it is customary for them to contain expanded and enlarged versions of the same sections that are found more briefly in Pāli. What is significant here is that the *gāthās* in *Mvastu.* are far less enlarged than the corresponding *sutta* in Pāli, and besides, the stanzas do not occur in the order in which the corresponding stanzas occur in *Sn.* A stanza parallel to *Sn.* 36 occurs at *Divy.* 294. It runs :

*Samsevamānasya bhavanti snehāḥ  
snehānvayaṃ sambhavatīha duḥkhaṃ/  
ādīnavaṃ snehagataṃ veditvā  
ekaś caret khadgaviṣāṇakalpah//*

(Attachments arise to him who associates with companions: misery in this world comes into being through attachment. Realizing the evil consequences bound up with attachments let him wander alone as the rhinoceros. The stanza that bears the closest resemblance in *Mvastu.* is st. 10,

*Samsevamānasya siyāti sneho  
snehānvayaṃ duḥkhamidaṃ prabhoti/  
putreṣu ādīnavaṃ sammrṣanto  
eko care khadgaviṣāṇakalpo//*

The occurrence of this stanza in *Divy.* may equally suggest that both *Mvastu.* and *Divy.* have drawn from an original *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* which is perhaps preserved in entirety in *Sn.* along with subsequent additions and there is sufficient proof to show that the Pāli version is an enlargement of an earlier existing nucleus. The fact that the Pāli *sutta* abounds in lyrical

13. I am indebted to Miss I. B. Horner for this observation.



beauty and that its general diction of poetical expression is highly refined, the existence of a super-abundance of similes and the use of illustrative examples (e.g. *Sn.* 48) are in support of it. The uniformity of the stanzas in language, syntax, style and metre shows that the expansion has taken place very early. Both *Nd2* and *Ap.* (I. 8-13) contain the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* in full, and this shows that the sutta as is found now was known from comparatively early times.

## 40

Before examining linguistic and other internal data it would be of some use to see how later writers looked upon this *sutta*. The *Comy.* and *Nd2* divide it up into four *vaggas*. The division is as follows:—

*Comy.* *Vagga* I, *Sn.* 35-44; II, *Sn.* 45-54; III, *Sn.* 55-64; IV, *Sn.* 65-75.

*Nd2.* *Vagga* I, *Sn.* 35-44; II, *Sn.* 45-55; III, *Sn.* 56-65; IV, *Sn.* 66-75. The Commentator states that all the stanzas were uttered as *udāna* by *Pacceka Buddhas* and gives the *aṭṭhuppatti* (context) of each stanza with the stories of these *Pacceka Buddhas*, some of whom he mentions by name. The 41 stanzas of the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* are incorporated in the *Pacceka-buddhāpadāna* (*Ap.* I, 7 ff.). The additional *gāthās* there (i.e. 1-7 and 50-58) serve as an introduction and a conclusion respectively. An extra stanza is added to the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* proper, i.e. stanza 8 which differs from 9 (= *Sn.* 35) only in line c; *mettena cittena hitānukampī* (= *Mvastu.* st. 2c). The *Comy.* of the *Apadāna* too mentions the names of several *Pacceka Buddhas*, but they are different from those given in *SnA*. The inclusion of this *sutta* in *Ap.* and the fact that it is commented in *Nd2* prove that it was known to the compilers of these respective works as it exists to-day. The independent existence of this *sutta* prior to the compilation of *Sn.* is seen from *Nd2* and *Mvastu.* which do not place it in a particular group such as the *Uraga Vagga*.

## 41

This *sutta*, like the *Uraga Sutta*, is undoubtedly meant for the benefit of the *muni* and belongs to that category of *suttas* which may be termed the “*muni-class*”. Forty of the forty-one stanzas contain the refrain exhorting one to lead a life of solitude.<sup>14</sup>

14. *Sn.* 45 which contains no refrain is to be found at *Vin.* I, 350, *M.* III, 154, *Dh.* 328, 329, *J.* III, 488 and *Dh.A.* I, 52 along with *Sn.* 46. In the above instances the line *eko care mātaṅgaraññe va nāgo* (vide I) is to be seen in place of the usual refrain. It is probable that the simile with the elephant was earlier than that with the rhinoceros whose solitary habits were not so well-known as those of the elephant. It is significant that in the older “lists” of wild animals *khagga* is not mentioned. (*J.V.* 416 is obviously late). In view of the above facts it is highly probable that *Sn.* 45 and 46 were importations to this *sutta* and that the line d of *Sn.* 46 was changed to suit the *sutta*.

The language of the *sutta*, on the whole is rather old, and may be said to belong to stratum of early *gāthā*-Pāli. Old forms, both verbal and nominal, archaic compounds, the vocabulary free from any late words, the simple constructions and very easy syntax suggest that the *gāthās* are rather old. The easy and fluent style and the diction which is definitely poetic add much to the lyrical beauty of the poem. The abundance of similes and the occasional imagery used may lead one to assign a more recent date to the poem, but these two facts merely emphasise the merits of the *sutta* as a ballad. The absence of anything artificial or laboured removes all doubts of its early date. The external evidence from *Nd2* and *Ap.* is quite overwhelming in favour of a comparatively early date, though *Mvastu.* seems to suggest that there may have existed a version still earlier than that found at *Sn.*, from which both *Sn.* and *Mvastu.* developed their respective versions.

The metre of the poem is regular *Triṣṭubh* with *anacrusis*<sup>15</sup> and *jagatī-pādas*<sup>16</sup> in a few lines. Neumann (*Reden*, p. 413) points out *tmesis* in *Sn.* 53b, which should normally read, *sañjātapadumīkhandho ulāro*. *Tmesis* is a very old poetical device which is rather frequent even in the *Rgveda*.

The *sutta* contains many linguistic forms that may be classified as old. There are three old ppr. forms in *-am*, old absolutes as *chetvāna* *Sn.* 44c, *bhetvā* *Sn.* 62b, agent nouns like *sahitā* *Sn.* 42c and *sammasitā* *Sn.* 69c, many historical absolutes ending in *-ya*, e.g. *aññāya*, *vineyya*, *Sn.* 58c, *abhibhuyya*, *Sn.* 45c, etc., optative 3rd singulars in *-etha*, e.g. *labhetha*, *Sn.* 45a, 46a, etc. (usually confined to the poetic language), probable dialectical forms as *kammāra*- *Sn.* 48b, *suhajje* *Sn.* 37a, and poetical forms as *seritam* *Sn.* 39c, 40c, *vaco* (Vedic) *Sn.* 54c, *rakkhitamānasāno* *Sn.* 63b, *upekham* *Sn.* 67c, 73a, *apekhā* *Sn.* 38b, and many elements which can be traced to Vedic, e.g. *atho*, etc. Some of the numerous cpds. used in the *sutta* seem to have become stereotyped already. Metrical lengthening is to be seen at *Sn.* 38c *vaṃsākalīro*, *Sn.* 49a *sahā*, *Sn.* 61c *mutīmā* and *Sn.* 70b *Satīmā*. *Dukha* is found for *dukkha* at *Sn.* 67a probably on the analogy of *sukha* or for purposes of metre. Similarly *aṭṭhānam* and *kāraṇatthāya* are contracted to *aṭṭhāna* *Sn.* 54a and *kāraṇatthā* *Sn.* 75a respectively. Judging from these instances the *sutta* as a whole bears a stamp of antiquity.

A few linguistic forms and other peculiarities of interest are:—**Khagga-visāṇakappo** *Sn.* 35d-44d and 46d-75d (already discussed), *vide Nd2.* 129 and *SnA.* 65. This *sutta* abounds in cpds; some of them like *yenicchakam* *Sn.* 39b, *itaritarena* *Sn.* 42b, *yathābhirantam* *Sn.* 53c, *analamkaritvā* *Sn.* 59b, are of special interest here as they occur in the prose canonical idiom

15. *Vide* Helmer Smith, *SnA.* 638. He points out *anacrusis* in *Sn.* 35b, 40c, 41c, 45c, 59b, 63c, 68c, 69c, and 71c.

16. *ibid.* *Sn.* 47a, 50a, 60ab, 66a and 70c.



as well. **Sneho** Sn. 36a cp. 36c. Both *sneha* and *sineha* occur in this *sutta*: see *sinehadosam* at Sn. 66c. There is no hard and fast rule regarding the consonantal group *sn-* in poetry, though prose generally prefers the forms with *svarabhakti*; (also vide Geiger, §52). Statistics would throw hardly any light on this point, for the use of forms with or without *svarabhakti* is mainly governed by metrical exigencies and poetic idiosyncrasies. **Pahoti** Sn. 36b is used in both prose and verse in the sense of ‘‘arise’’ though *pabhavati* is restricted to poetry (s.v., P.T.S.). **Pekkhamāno** Sn. 36c, etc. There are 18 medial ppr. forms in *-māna* in this *sutta*. Of the 350 ppr. forms in Sn. as many as 139 are medials, 107 of which end in *-māna*. The fact that this form is used in all periods of Pāli does not preclude the possibilities of the stanzas being old when other corroborative evidence is taken into account. **Suhajje** Sn. 37a (cp. *kosajja*) appears to be a dialectical word. The Pāli word parallel to Sk. *suhṛd* is *suhada*, but this form probably was an analogical derivation from the abstract *sau-hṛd-ya* > *sohajja*. The other possibility is that *sohajja* the secondary form from *suhada* became *suhajja* by the weakening of the vowel *o*; *o* > *u* cp. Sk. *asau* > Māgadhī *aso* > P. *asu* also Gen. pl. *guṇṇaṃ* (Sk. *goṇaṃ*) and Sk. *sadyah* > P. *sajju*. **Sahitā** Sn. 42c (cp. *sammasitā* Sn. (69c)). There are 21 such historical agent nouns in Sn. which should all be ascribed to an early stratum in Pāli though canonical and later prose also contains them. **Atho** Sn. 43b, *atho* is formed from the copulative (and adverbial) particle *atha* and the enclitic *u*, and can be traced back to the later hymns of the *Rgveda* and the *Śathapatha Brāhmaṇa*<sup>17</sup>. This compound particle appears to be restricted to poetry and occurs no less than 25 times in Sn. alone. **Saddhimcaram** Sn. 45b, 46b, *saddhim*—*cara* (the adjectival suffix from  $\sqrt{car}$ ) cp. *dada* in *paññādada* Kh. VIII 10 or *kāmadada* Pv. II, 9.1. As the cpd. is formed from the indeclinable *saddhim* and it retains the nasal as in *analamkaritvā* Sn. 59b, *rattimdivaṃ* Sn. 507c, 114b it is of special interest. **Kammāra** Sn. 48a is a Prakritism used in all stages of the language, in the specialised meaning of ‘‘smith’’. Sk. *karma-kāra* > P. *Itamma-kāra* > ‘*kamma-āra* (cp. *ajja-utta* for *urya-putra*) > P. *kammāra*; cp. *Kṛṣṇāgāra* > P. *Kusinārā*. **Phassaye** Sn. 54b is probably a dialectical form. The root *spṛś* is treated as a verb in class X, perhaps on the analogy of forms like *cintaye*. The direct historical forms should be *phasse* and *phuse*. **Rakkhitamānasāno** Sn. 63b. *nom. sg.* is formed by adding the adjectival suffix *-na* to *mānasa* the secondary form of *manas*. This too is a pure poetic form.

The doctrinal import of this *sutta* has already been touched upon. It has been emphasised earlier that the quest of the secluded life pertains to

17. Vide Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar for Students*, pp. 214-215.



the earliest stage of Buddhism and sheds much light on the life of the hermits (*munayo*). A noticeable development in doctrine in the *sutta* is the concept of a noble companion (39). It has been pointed out above that the *Khaḍgaviṣāṇa Gāthā* in *Mvastu*. make no mention of this type of companion. If the version in *Mvastu*. is considered as representing an earlier form of this *sutta*, perhaps a form nearer the nucleus out of which the present long *sutta* has developed, it may be justifiable to infer that this concept is a later accretion. On the other hand, it is more probable that the idea of a *kalyāṇa-mitta* developed in the Theravāda School before the time of composition of the Pāli *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta*. The references to *kalyāṇa-mitta* (virtuous companion) at *Sn.* 338a, *mittasampadam* (good companionship) at *Kh.* VIII, 14, *sahāya-sampadam* at *Sn.* 47a, etc. (s.v., P.T.S. for more references) do not make it clear whether the idea developed early or not, but the idea of the *kalyāṇa-mitta* as the spiritual advisor or guide appears frequently in younger contexts (s.v., P.T.S.). The term parallel to the earlier concept in Buddhism is to be found in *sādhusaṅga* of the epics (*Mbh.*). It is not in the latter developed meaning that these terms occur in this *sutta*. Although this idea is rather contradictory to that of *ekacariyā* it cannot be considered as late. The uniformity in language and metre makes the possibilities of a wholesale interpolation improbable. The lack of consistency in the logical trend of the *sutta* may indicate that the verses had existed earlier in some unsettled order and that the present order is due to the efforts of a monastic editor.

Another important concept that is taken for granted is *mettā*. It is alluded to at *Sn.* 42a, *Cātuddiso appaṭigho ca hoti*. (He has no conflicts from the four quarters), and is mentioned later on in the *sutta* at *Sn.* 73 along with *upe(k)khā*, *karuṇā*, *vimutti* and *muditā*. The idea of *mettā* (friendliness, amity) is a central concept in Buddhism, both early and late. Four of the five items mentioned at *Sn.* 73 came later to be classified as the *brahmavihāras*. Besides the fact that no specific mention of the *brahmavihāras* is made, the four items which constitute it do not occur here in their classified order; i.e. *mettā*, *karuṇā*, *muditā* and *upekkhā*. There is no doubt whatsoever that these concepts go back to the earliest phase of Buddhism and perhaps Mrs. Rhys Davids is right when she speaks of *brahmavihāra* as a later term for these four items,<sup>18</sup> though the name itself is not late and is applied to *mettā* alone at *Sn.* 151d. This *sutta* thus reflects a time prior to these concepts being labelled as *brahmavihāras*.

The expression *aññāya atthāni* at *Sn.* 58c (having known the *atthas*) demands attention. The explanation at *Nd*2, 85, *atta'ttha*, *para'ttha*, *ubhaya'ttha*, *diṭṭhadhamma'ttha*, *samparāyika'ttha* and *parama'ttha* (own

18. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Outlines of Buddhism*, pp 32 ff. and *What was the Original Gospel in Buddhism?* pp. 92 ff.



welfare, others' welfare, welfare of both, welfare in this world, welfare after-death and highest welfare), merely suggests the various implications. *SnA.* 111 agrees with this explanation. It is quite probable that *attha* here meant not only *paramattha*—the *summum bonum* in Buddhism, but embraces a still wider meaning as suggested by the commentaries and is probably connected with the *attha* suggested earlier in connection with the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* (*PBR* 1, 3, p. 143).

All the other terms and topics of doctrinal import in the *sutta* are to be met with in other Pāli works, both old and young, and therefore demand no particular attention. Worldly attachments and ties (*Sn.* 35 ff.), lustful tendencies (*Sn.* 50), materialistic leanings (*Sn.* 54), and perverse views (*Sn.* 55), are denounced. The five obstacles to progress (mentioned by number only) are to be abandoned (*Sn.* 66) and *upe(k)khā* is to be developed (*Sn.* 67). The positive side of the life of a *muni* discussed in *Sn.* 65-74 necessitates the mention of many terms which have acquired a technical significance. The complete list of instructions at *Sn.* 69 may seem to appear rather late on account of the fact that many important concepts are heaped together, but the haphazard manner in which the items occur does not show any sign of lateness. Moreover, all the topics mentioned there are quite consistent with the general theme of the *sutta* as well as the life of the early hermits. *Rāga*, *dosa* and *moha* which are mentioned at *Sn.* 74a suggest that they have almost reached the stage of being classified into the stereotyped group of the three *akusalamūlāni*; but the term as such does not occur here. Generally speaking, the *sutta* on doctrinal evidence represents an early phase of Buddhism.

## 43

Other internal evidence consists of social conditions reflected in the *sutta* and other casual references. As far as social conditions go not many data can be gathered, as the *sutta* paints a picture of the life of recluses only. The reference made to some (*eke*) discontented *pabbajitas* at *Sn.* 43 may be an allusion to a contemporary sect or class. It is difficult to say who these recluses were from the scanty evidence available. The stanza seems to bear a faint connection with *Sn.* 45ab, which can be considered as referring to the philosophy of such a sect. Yet, it is not possible to establish a definite link between the two, as *sāmayikaṃ vimuttiṃ* may not refer to any particular view, but to temporal joys.<sup>19</sup> It is only

19. *Vide SnA.* 105, *sāmayikaṃ vimuttiṃ ti lokiyasamāpattiṃ, sā hi appitappitasamaye eva paccanīkehi vimuccanato sāmayikā vimuttiṃ ti vuccati* (cp. *PtsA.* III, 552 ff.)—Temporal emancipation means worldly attainments. It is called temporal emancipation because whenever one indulges (in these pleasures, cp. *Sn.* 54b) one is emancipated from what is unpleasant.

probable that these two stanzas refer to a sect of materialists (Cārvākas). There are numerous references to materialists and their doctrines in the Nikāyas (*Sāmaññaphala Sutta*, etc.), and according to Rhys Davids, they must have preceded Buddhism as early Buddhist literature mentions them.<sup>20</sup>

The line *Sn. 75b, nikkāraṇā dullabhā ajja mittā* (friends without a motive are rare today) seems to refer to the time of composition of the *sutta*. This by itself is of no great significance, for human nature has been the same through the ages. Along with this may be compared *Th. I, 949-980* where Phussa prophesies that the future of the Sangha would be gloomy. The passage is a condemnation of the white-robed ascetics, and shows the rivalry between the ascetics and the monks. The prophecy actually alludes to the time of compilation of these *gāthās*. In the *Sutta Nipāta* the significant point is the mention of the word *ajja*, though it does not in any way help to determine the date of the *sutta*.

## 44

Taking all the evidence into consideration an early date may be assigned to the *sutta*. Linguistically, it is seen to preserve an early stratum of Pāli. Doctrinally, it represents an early phase of Buddhism, tinged with the germs of some important tenets of that phase of Buddhism which came to be termed Theravāda. External evidence within the Pāli Canon itself suggests an early date for all the stanzas of the *sutta*, but evidence from *Mvastu*. and *Divy.* seem to indicate that the Pāli *sutta* was an enlargement of an earlier nucleus. Metre shows that all the stanzas in the poem should belong to the same period if not to one author. The style too is uniform throughout the *sutta*.

## THE MUNI SUTTA

## 45

The *Muni Sutta* portrays certain characteristics of the *muni*—the sage. The poem agrees in theme with the *Uraga* and *Khaggavisāṇa Suttas*. These three *suttas* together with *Moneyya Sutta* (i.e. *Nālaka* excluding its *vatthugāthā*) can be considered as the proper “*Muni*—ballads”, though there is constant mention of the attributes of the *muni* in the greater part of the *Sabhiya Sutta* and many *suttas* of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* such as *Jarā*, *Tissametteyya* and *Māgandiya*. It has already been noted that the *Uraga Sutta* resembles this *sutta* in many respects. While the *Uraga Sutta* describes the ideal *bhikkhu*, the *Muni Sutta* gives a descriptive definition

20. Rhys Davids, *American Lectures*, p. 24.



of the *muni*. Generally speaking, there appears no fundamental difference between the *muni* and the *bhikkhu* in early Buddhism, and the terms are interchangeable, except when *muni* specifically refers to the Buddha. The qualities attributed to the *muni* are often associated with the *bhikkhu*, and sometimes with *brāhmaṇa*, *khattiya*, *vedagu* and *sottiya* in a strict Buddhist sense.<sup>21</sup> Although *bhikkhu* and *muni* are virtually synonymous there seems to be a subtle difference between the two. While renunciation, *pabbajjā* (becoming a religious mendicant), detachment and *ekacariyā* (life of solitude) are emphasised of the *bhikkhu*, the *muni* is described as a person who plays a more important rôle. This is quite evident from his description in the *Muni* and *Moneyya Suttas*, and the type of epithets used about him. In addition to the possession of all the characteristics of the *bhikkhu*, there appears something nobler and more positive about him than about the *bhikkhu*. He is a more evolved being (*bhāvitatta*) who has reached spiritual attainments and instructs others as well. The term *muni* in *Sn.* is used in a much wider meaning than *bhikkhu* in *Th.* 1.

As regards the epithets, the *muni* is called a *mahesi* (*Sn.* 208<sup>d</sup>) and is described as *tādī* (*Sn.* 219<sup>b</sup>), *yatatta* (*Sn.* 216<sup>b</sup>), *saññatatta* (*Sn.* 216<sup>a</sup>) and *ṭhitatta* (*Sn.* 215<sup>a</sup>). Besides the eight references<sup>22</sup> where Buddha is called *mahesi*, the true *brāhmaṇa* (in the strict Buddhist sense) is spoken of as *mahesi* at *Sn.* 646,<sup>b</sup> also the *khiṇāsava* is referred to as a *mahesi* at *Sn.* 82<sup>a</sup> and 481<sup>a</sup>, though the allusion is to the Buddha. The epithet *tādī* is rather puzzling as it cannot be easily differentiated from *tādī* (Sk. *tādṛk* also P. *tādiso*) the demonstrative adjective. Yet, there are sufficient instances in *Sn.* itself where *tādī* is clearly used in the pregnant sense of *ecce homo*. The *muni* is *ubhayeneva tādī* at *Sn.* 712<sup>c</sup> (unchanged under both circumstances) in the *Nāḷaka Sutta*. *Paramatṭhaka* speaks of the *bhikkhu* as, *pāraṃgato na pacceti tādī* (gone over yonder such—a steadfast one—is he who returns not;—*Sn.* 803<sup>d</sup>). The Buddha is called *asitaṃ* and *tādiṃ* at *Sn.* 957<sup>a</sup>, cp. *Sn.* 219<sup>c</sup> *asitaṃ anāsavaṃ*). The *maggajina* is called *tādī* at *Sn.* 86<sup>d</sup> in the *Cunda Sutta*. The *brāhmaṇa*, *khettaṭṭhina* (cp. Sk. *kṣetrarjña*), *vedagu* and *sottiya*—all of them in a Buddhist sense—are called *tādī* in the *Sabhiya Sutta* (*Sn.* 519-532). Another attribute of the *muni*—*yatatta* (self restrained)—is repeated at *Sn.* 723<sup>a</sup> in the *Moneyya Sutta*. Homeless recluses are called *yatattā* at *Sn.* 490<sup>b</sup>. It is practically the same idea conveyed by the term *saññatatta* (self-subdued). The brahmins of old are referred to as *saññatattā* at *Sn.* 284<sup>b</sup> (*Brāhmaṇadhammika Sutta*), and *susaññatattā* occurs at *Sn.* 464<sup>b</sup> (*Sundarikabhāradvāja Sutta*). The *muni* is known to be *ṭhitatta* (steadfast), so also is the virtuous monk described in the *Kimsīla Sutta* (*Sn.* 328<sup>d</sup>) the *bhikkhu* who renounces the world in

21. See Sabhiya Sutta *Sn.* 111, 6.

22. *Sn.* 176<sup>d</sup>, 177<sup>d</sup>, 915<sup>b</sup>, 1054<sup>a</sup>, 1057<sup>a</sup>, 1061<sup>b</sup>, 1067<sup>b</sup>, and 1083<sup>a</sup>.

the proper manner (Sn. 370<sup>c</sup>) and the good *brāhmaṇa* (Sn. 519<sup>b</sup>). Further, it is used as an attribute of the Tathāgata at Sn. 477.<sup>b</sup> The *muni* is also called *asitaṃ* and *anāsavaṃ* (independent and free from the banes). The Buddha is described as *asito* at Sn. 251<sup>d</sup> and 957<sup>a</sup>. The true *brāhmaṇa* (*brahmā* in the text) is called *asito* at Sn. 519<sup>d</sup>. Again the monk who has drawn out the dart is described as *asito* at Sn. 593<sup>a</sup> and so is the *muni* in the *Moneyya Sutta*. The *māṇava* Dhotaka begs for instruction so that he may lead a life of peace and independence; (*idheva santo asito careyyaṃ*—Sn 1065<sup>b</sup>).

It is evident that these standard epithets of the *muni* definitely speak of the positive side of his life. Many of these terms are not employed to describe the *bhikkhu* though he may possess the qualities which these epithets attribute to the *muni*. There is some implied superiority of the *muni* over the *bhikkhu* though the ideal of the *bhikkhu* is in no way to be understood as falling short of that of the *muni*.

There are various other attributes of the *muni* enumerated in the *sutta*. He has no fixed abode and he is free from any acquaintanceship (Sn. 207). He has eradicated all sin; and is the lonely wanderer (cp. Sn. 35-75) who has visioned the state of peace (Sn. 208). He sees the ultimate destruction of birth, leaves reasoning behind and is under no limitations of time and space (Sn. 209). He is free from covetousness and has reached the Beyond—*pāra*—(Sn. 210). He is *sabbābhibhu*—one who overcomes every obstacle and is superior to all others;—he has perfect knowledge and is unsmeared by the worldly phenomena and is emancipated. (These are the attributes of the Bhagavā mentioned at M. 1, 171 S. II. 284, Vin. I. 8 and Dh. 353)—(Sn. 211). He is wise and composed, and is free from the mental obsessions; he delights in meditation, wanders alone and leads others (Sn. 212-213). He is firm and straight, discerning, free from lust and he shrinks from sin. His senses are serene and he is endowed with propriety of speech (Sn. 214-215). He is self-restrained and self-subdued (Sn. 216). He knows the world and sees the highest *attha* (well-being). He has crossed the *ogha* (flood) and the *samudda* (ocean), has cut off all knots, has nothing to lean on and is steadfast.

The *sutta* in every respect is Buddhistic and the terms and values in it bear ample testimony to that effect. The simple allegory taken from the uprooting of a tree or of not sowing the seed (of *taṇhā*) developed to a considerable extent in Sn. 208-209, the shunning of resting places of the mind (*nivesanāni*)—Sn. 210, cp. also *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*, remaining unsullied by worldly phenomena, and such other central concepts of early Buddhism, prove that the *sutta* contains very early Buddhist sayings and there is much evidence to show that the subject-matter of this *sutta* is very old. The



theme of the *sutta* (as well as that of many other poems of *Sn.*) is closely connected with the yogic ideal. The *muni* chooses with stoic indifference the middle way between self-mortification and attachment to worldly enjoyment. This ideal as current in pre-Asokan times coincides with the yogic ideal promulgated in the *Gitā* (*Bhg.* II-VI. cp. *Bhg.* II, 56; II, 69; V, 6; V, 28; VI, 3, etc., where the *muni* is mentioned in similar words).

## 46

The stanzas themselves need a close examination before the internal, external and indirect evidence is taken up for discussion. A simple analysis of the *sutta* shows that its stanzas fall into three groups; viz.—

- Group I. *Sn.* 207-210,
- Group II. *Sn.* 211-219 and
- Group III. *Sn.* 220-221.

**Group I.**—The four opening *stanzas* seem to form an independent unit—a short poem by itself. Unlike the nine stanzas that follow, these verses do not contain the refrain (*taṃ vā pi dhīrā munim vedayanti*); but it is quite significant that the word *muni* occurs at least once in every stanza of the whole *sutta*. *Sn.* 207 furnishes the introduction to the independent unit as well as to the whole poem. A noteworthy feature of this stanza is that it is in *Anuṣṭubh śloka* whereas the rest of the poem is in *Triṣṭubh*. The stanza itself cannot, on this account, be brushed aside as a late introductory verse, for it was obviously known to have belonged to the *Muni Sutta* at least some time prior to the compilation of the *Milindapañha*.<sup>23</sup> The stanza itself breathes the same tone as the opening verses of the *Khagga-visāṇa Sutta*—cp. *etaṃ bhayaṃ santhave pekkhamāno*, *Sn.* 37<sup>a</sup>. *Gāme akubbaṃ muni santhavāni* at *Sn.* 844<sup>b</sup> is also reminiscent of the opening *pāda*. The same idea is expanded at *Dh.* 212-216, viz.—*Dh.* 212 *Piyato jāyatī soko piyato jāyatī bhayaṃ* (from what is pleasant arise grief and fear)—, *Dh.* 213 *pemato*.. (from affection..), *Dh.* 214 *ratiyā*.. (from lust..), *Dh.* 215 *kāmato*.. (from sense-pleasures..) and *Dh.* 216 *taṇhāya*.. (from avarice..). All these causes of suffering or sorrow seem to be embraced by the term *santhava*, cp. also *J.* IV. 312.

The next stanza (*Sn.* 208) introduces the familiar Buddhist allegory (already referred to) in which *santhava* (Comy. *taṇhā*) is the tree that has to be uprooted. What has arisen has to be annihilated (eradicated), it should not be allowed to grow anew (lit. not replanted), and it should not be allowed to grow up when it has sprung. This allegory is further

23. *Milp.* 385 quotes this stanza thus:—*Bhāsitam-p'ctam-mahārāja Bhagavatā devā-tidevena Suttanipāte*, and quotes *Sn.* 207. The stanza is the topic of a *pañha* at *Milp.* 212 ff. and is quoted several times there.

worked out in the next stanza (*Sn.* 209). The *vatthūni*—lit. fields or bases—have to be reckoned, and the seed (Comy. *abhisāṅkhāraviññāṇa*—“storing intellect”) has to be destroyed (Comy. *himsitvā, vadhivā*—Sk. *pramārya* from  $\sqrt{mr.}$  *mṛṇāti*)—and it is not to be watered with *sineha* (desire). *Sn.* 210 forms the conclusion of this independent unit. Judging by the ideas in them these four stanzas, taken by themselves, appear to be very old. This is further strengthened by the Commentator’s testimony. He says that the *uppatti* (origin) of the whole *sutta* is not the same (*Sn.A.* 254). He gives the same *uppatti* for these four stanzas, but gives separate *uppattis* for each succeeding stanza. The Commentator’s introduction seems rather strained and reports a somewhat incredible incident found also at *A.* III. 67-69 (*Mātāputtika Sutta* // o *A.* III. 559). This tradition though as late as cc. 5th century A.C. cannot be totally ignored, as it is supported by the *Anguttara Nikāya*. On the other hand even if there is no connection between the incident narrated in *Sn.A.* 254 ff. and these four stanzas, the very fact of the existence of the strong tradition that these four stanzas were found together, the internal evidence of the subject matter, and the recurrence of the opening stanza four times in *Milp.* attest to their great antiquity.

**Group II.**—The refrain is found in all these stanzas and all of them are uniform except *Sn.* 213 which contains seven *pādas* instead of four. The three additional *pādas* are the same as *Sn.* 71<sup>abc</sup> in the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta*. The influence of the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* is felt in *ekam carantaṃ munim appamattaṃ* at *Sn.* 213<sup>a</sup> and, *tam āhu ekam muninaṃ carantaṃ* at *Sn.* 208<sup>c</sup>, besides the repeated *pādas* *Sn.* 213<sup>cde</sup>. The four lines would have been complete and the stanza would have passed without special notice, but for these additional *pādas* which in all probability were interpolated later. It is very unlikely that the whole stanza was an interpolation, although the ideas contained in it are closely related to the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta*. Similarly *Sn.* 211 cannot be considered as an interpolation though the first three *pādas* occur elsewhere in connection with the Buddha’s meeting with the *ājīvaka* Upaka.<sup>24</sup> In all these instances these words are put into the mouth of the Bhagavā making him utter a boastful statement, which is quite contrary to his usual reticence about himself. It is quite probable that this was the original occurrence of these lines and that other texts may have drawn upon this stanza in reporting the incident between the Buddha and the mendicant Upaka. The repetition of the simile, *tasaram va ujjum* (like a shuttle that is straight) at *Sn.* 464<sup>b</sup> and 497<sup>b</sup> does not indicate that the idea has been borrowed in any of these instances, but that it was the common property of the poetical language.

24. Vide *Ariyapariyesana Sutta*, Vinaya Introduction, etc.



These nine stanzas form, as it were, the body of the *Muni Sutta*. They constitute the ballad proper, with the emphasis on the *muni* clearly brought out by the refrain and the similes at *Sn.* 213<sup>cde</sup>, 214<sup>a</sup> and 215<sup>a</sup>. These stanzas form a homogeneous unit, just as the first four stanzas form a unit by themselves. The chief ideas of this section are seen to occur again in other ballads of *Sn.* as well as in other metrical works. *Pādas* and lines of many stanzas are also repeated in other metrical works.<sup>25</sup>

According to Buddhaghosa the 11 stanzas beginning with *Sn.* 211 were uttered on various occasions by the Buddha and these sayings were gathered from various isolated instances and knitted together into a composite *sutta*. The *uppattīs* (origins) given by him are:—

*Sn.* 211—uttered on the occasion of Buddha's meeting the *ājīvaka* Upaka. (*SnA.* 258) cp. Comy. on *Dh.* 353. *Sn.* 212—uttered about Khadirāvaniya Revata. (*SnA.* 261) cp. Comy. on *Dh.* 98 and *Dh.* 412, *Sn.* 213—preached to Suddhodana. (*SnA.* 262). *Sn.* 214—uttered after Ciñcāmānavikā's attempt to malign the Buddha. (*SnA.* 263) cp. Comy. on *Dh.* 176 and *Sn.* 780. *Sn.* 215—preached to the girl who was inspired by the straightness of the movement of the shuttle. (*SnA.* 265). *Sn.* 216—preached on the occasion of the weaver girl's solution of the Buddha's riddle. (*SnA.* 266) cp. Comy. on *Dh.* 174. *Sn.* 217—preached to the Pañcaggadāyaka-brāhmaṇa. (*SnA.* 270) cp. Comy. on *Dh.* 367. *Sn.* 218—preached to the monks, announcing the attainment of arahatship of a monk who had fluctuated four times between home and homelessness. (*SnA.* 272). *Sn.* 219—preached to the monks, announcing Nanda's attainment of arahatship. (*SnA.* 273) cp. Comy. on *Dh.* 15. *Sn.* 220—preached to the monks, announcing the arahatship of a monk who was alleged to have aided a hunter. (*SnA.* 275). *Sn.* 221—preached on the occasion when the Sakiyas argued that a *Sotāpanna*, even if he is a householder, should be honoured by another who reaches that stage subsequent to him. (*SnA.* 276).

It is not at all probable that these stanzas were "independent utterances" made on "various occasions" as Bdhgh. says. The coherence of thought and the inter-dependence between the succeeding verses and those preceding, indicate to what extent these stanzas are connected with one another. In all probability these nine stanzas (and perhaps *Sn.* 207-210) were the work of a single poet though it is very doubtful whether the two concluding stanzas too belonged to him. The significance of the diversity of the *uppattīs* of these stanzas given by Bdhgh. is that the verses themselves were so well-known that there were separate stories appended to them by Commentarial tradition. This perhaps speaks of the popularity that these verses enjoyed.

25. Vide E. M. Hare: *Woven Cadences*, p. 190.

**Group III.**—The last two stanzas of the poem stand out as a class by themselves as (a) they contain no refrain (b) point out the difference between the householder and the *muni*. Although these two stanzas are similar to the rest of the poem in language, metre and style, the change of values and the contrast made between the householder and the *muni* (emphasising the latter's superiority in the simile at Sn. 221<sup>ab</sup>) are indicative of an effort made by a monastic editor to usher in to this poem of lofty theme and ideals, an idea of comparative insignificance. Their position as the last two stanzas of the final *sutta* (of the *vagga*) suggests that they may as well have been intended to form the very conclusion of the *whole vagga*. In view of their decidedly late characteristics and the indirect evidence from the position of the *sutta* it is clear that these two stanzas were added when the *sutta* was re-edited before its inclusion in *Sutta Nipāta*.<sup>26</sup>

## 47

The language of the *sutta* is old and all the stanzas are composed in the archaic poetic dialect often called 'gāthā-Pāli'. There are many linguistic forms in the *sutta* that belong to an early stratum of Pāli, and forms which may be classed as late are totally absent. The usual historical verbal forms like Optative 3 sg. P. *pada* in—e, A. *pada* in—etha, the historical sibilant Aorist (*addakkhi*, Sn. 208<sup>b</sup>), absolutes in —ya (7 of them), old present participles in—am (*anikāmayam* Sn. 210<sup>b</sup>), and old infinitives (like *thutum* Sn. 217<sup>c</sup>) as well as nominal forms such as *rajo* (Sn. 207<sup>b</sup>), *muninam* (Sn. 208<sup>c</sup>), *gedha* (Sn. 210<sup>c</sup>), and *ubho* (Sn. 220<sup>a</sup>), dialectal or local forms such as *anuppavecche* (Sn. 208<sup>b</sup>, 209<sup>b</sup>) and *ujjum* (Sn. 215<sup>a</sup>), and historical particles like *ve* (Sn. 207<sup>d</sup>; Vedic *vai*) etc. show that the language of the *sutta* is old. The linguistic forms of interest in this *sutta* are:—*ropayeyya*, Sn. 208<sup>a</sup>; The causative is formed after verbs of class X, and -eyy- is added. This is a pure Pāli form. *Assa*, Sn. 208<sup>b</sup>; This should be interpreted as a dative, as in Comy. i.e., as *assa jāyantassa* with elipsis—(SnA. 256). The two lines would then read:—*Yo jātam ucchijja, jāyantam na ropayeyya, assa (jāyantassa) nānuppavecche. Anuppavecche*, Sn. 208<sup>b</sup>, 209<sup>b</sup>. (Comy. *anuppaveseyya, samodhāneyya*—should permit entry or fulfilment). There are three possible explanations to this curious form:—1- (Trenckner).  $\sqrt{yam} yaccha > *yeccha- > veccha-$  cp.  $y > v$  in *āyudha > āvudha* etc. (vide Geiger, §46), and the vowel change

26. The composite character of the *Muni Sutta* may suggest the existence of different recensions before it took its final shape in Sn. At present it is not possible to decide to what recension of it the title *Muni-gāthā* was applicable. (The possibility of the name referring to all poems in praise of the *muni*-ideal as suggested by Max Walleiser, also needs consideration). The inclusion of the *sutta* in Sn. is relatively late as compared with the date of its composition.



-a- > -c- cp. *sa-yathā* > *seyyathā*, (*pavekkhe* etc.) 2-√*viś* > Caus. *veśyet* (Opt.) > *vesse-* > -cche. cp. -ts- > -ss- // -cch- (Sk. *utsaṅga*. P. *ussaṅga* //, *ucchaṅga*).<sup>27</sup> (If it could be established that -ś- > -cch, just as ś- > ch- (initially) as in *chakana*, *chava*, *chāpa* or *cheppā*, the form might as well be derived from opt. of √*viś*, i.e. \**veśyet* on the analogy of class IV verbs). 3-The optative of the future base of √*viś* i.e. \**vek-* > \**vekkhe* (// E. Pkr.) or \**vecche* (// to W. Pkr.) would be the same as this form.<sup>28</sup> **Thambho-r-iva**, Sn. 214<sup>a</sup>; This is an inorganic *sandhi* with the artificial replacement of the historical-*h* which, with the preceding *a* i.e. -*aḥ*, has already become -*o*; *iva* is retained as in Sk. **Ubho**, Sn. 220<sup>a</sup>; <*ubhau*, the Vedic dual. It is a historical form. **Ujjum**, Sn. 215<sup>a</sup>; dialectal or Prākritic *ṛju* > \**i/u-ṛju* (with epenthesis) > *ujju*. **Nālaṃ thutum**, Sn. 217<sup>c</sup>; the old construction with *alaṃ* and the infinitive; Sk. *stautum* > \**thotum* > P. *thutum*.

**Metre.**—The difference in metre between the opening stanza and the rest of the poem has already been commented on. This difference of metre in the introductory verse is quite similar to that in the opening verse in *Kimsīla Sutta*. It was probably on verses like these that the practice of prefacing *suttas* with *vatthugāthā* was based. The opening stanza is a regular *Anuṣṭubh śloka* with an odd quarter in line c. The rest of the poem is in *Triṣṭubh* metre with *Jagatī pādas* at Sn. 212<sup>c</sup>, 214<sup>ac</sup> 218<sup>b</sup>, 219<sup>c</sup> and 220<sup>a</sup>-221<sup>d</sup>. The caesura after the 7th syllable is not reckoned in Sn. 210<sup>c</sup> and 221<sup>a</sup> (*Jagatī*). There are two difficult *pādas* (Sn. 214<sup>a</sup> and 215<sup>b</sup>) and Helmer Smith (Sn.A. 639) suggests *yōgāhane* and *kammahi* for *yo ogahane* and *kammehi* respectively. There is metrical lengthening in *santhavāto* (Sn. 207<sup>a</sup>), *munī* (Sn. 209<sup>c</sup>, 210<sup>c</sup>, 216<sup>b</sup>, and 220<sup>d</sup>. v.l. *muni*.) *nāyūhatī* (Sn. 210<sup>d</sup> v.l. -*i*), *anupalittam* (Sn. 211<sup>b</sup> v.l. -*u*-) and *satīmam* (Sn. 212<sup>b</sup>). Both forms *gihi* (Sn. 220<sup>a</sup> v.l. -*ī*) and *gihī* (Sn. 220<sup>c</sup> and 221<sup>c</sup> v.l. -*i*) occur. Though metre, as a rule, is no sound criterion, the old metres employed in this *sutta* further support other evidence which shows that the poem is old.

**Style**—There is nothing extraordinary as regards the style of the *sutta*. Throughout the poem the diction of the stanzas is purely poetic, and figurative speech is freely used, e.g. Sn. 209<sup>d</sup>, 219<sup>bc</sup> etc. Simile and metaphor play an important part. In addition to the popular similes mentioned already there is a simile at Sn. 221<sup>ab</sup>. The allegory at Sn. 208-209 also enhances the poetic effect. E. M. Hare (p. 218) considers that *pamāya* (Sn. 209<sup>a</sup>) is a *ślesa* (pun) i.e. from √*mā* and √*mṛ*. There are a few instances of alliteration (Sn. 211) and assonance (Sn. 219<sup>b</sup>—*atitariya lādim*). These poetical devices which are not too frequently

27. Vide Müller; *Pali Grammar*, p. 120.

28. Vide Geiger, § 152 note 3.

employed in the *sutta* do not in, any way mar the style as in late artificial poetry. The refrain in *Sn.* 211-219, the popular similes used, and the perfect rhythm and cadence, all point to a literary style which is essentially that of the ballad, and therefore popular.

**Doctrinal Developments**—Besides the epithets used for the *muni*, which have definite values and an underlying technical significance there are a few terms in the *sutta* which show a transition from the general meaning to a more restricted connotation indicating a gradual development in doctrine. The word *santhava* (*Sn.* 207<sup>a</sup>) implies not only acquaintances but also all forms of ties, attachments and worldly bonds arising out of the association with them (cp. *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta*). The words *vatthūni*, *bījaṃ* and *sinehaṃ*, though allegorically used have a faint technical significance; and these words in course of time came to be looked upon as synonyms for the various objects they stood for. This process is easily discernible, in the case of *sineha* on account of the semantic development of the word (*sineha*=liquid and affection), and became most pronounced in the Commentarial epoch. Neumann<sup>29</sup> suggests that *takkaṃ* and *saṅkhaṃ* at *Sn.* 209<sup>d</sup> were references to popular philosophical systems Tārkyam and Sāṅkhyam. It is not at all likely that *takka* and *sankha* were references to any definite philosophical system so much as to any speculative doctrine which professed to achieve salvation by way of knowledge—*jñāna* as opposed to *yoga*.<sup>30</sup> *Saṅkhaṃ* cannot be an allusion to the philosophical system known as Sāṅkhya originated by Kapila, before Buddhism, but developed centuries later. It has been rightly pointed out by Neumann (*ibid*) that the *muni* seeks no resting place as the *yogi* as stated at *Mbh. Sāntiparvan* 302, *pratyakṣa hetavo yogāḥ, sāṅkhyāḥ śāstravinicayāḥ*. The phrase *saṅkhaṃ na upeti*, however, is intrinsically connected with *na saṅkhaṃ gacchati* (does not enter the category of, or, is not reckoned as) occurring often in canonical Pāli. The only point worth investigating here is to what category (lit. number) the *muni* does not belong. The explanation of this phrase in the Comy. (*SnA.* 257) that the *muni* does not enter the category of “a divine being or an(ordinary) man” or even of “a person of lustful temperament or of malicious temperament” sheds some light. In short, the idea implied is that the *muni* is beyond worldly limitations—an idea quite in harmony with the conception of a perfect *muni*.

The term *nivesana* (*Sn.* 210<sup>a</sup>) as ‘a resting place for the mind, a dogma’ is a word adapted by early Buddhism giving it a special meaning. It has no special doctrinal significance, apart from the fact that this specialised

29. *Dic Reden Gotamo Buddhos*, p. 437.

30. *Vide* Franklin Edgerton: “Sāṅkhya and Yoga in the Epics”—*American Journal of Philology*, 1924.



meaning was attached to it from very early times. The idea of being free from such *nivesanāni* (or-*nivesā* 785<sup>a</sup>) occurs also at *Sn.* 470<sup>ab</sup>, 801<sup>c</sup>, 846<sup>d</sup>, and 1055.<sup>c</sup> *Sn.* 785 describes the nature of dogmatic beliefs. The term *pāra* and the idea of 'going beyond' (*pāra*+ $\sqrt{\text{gam}}$ )—*Sn.* 210<sup>d</sup> have been discussed in the introduction to the *Pārāyana Vagga*.<sup>31</sup> The words *ogha* and *samudda* *Sn.* 219<sup>b</sup> are used to signify the ills of the world in much the same way as *vatthūni*, *bījāni* and *sineha*, but *ogha* seems to have already acquired a technical significance as seen from its occurrences in *Sn.*<sup>32</sup>

The doctrinal emphasis of this *sutta* is on the conduct of the *muni*. This itself shows that the *sutta* reflects an early period. Most of the terminology of the *sutta*, apart from the basic concepts such as *saṅga*, *santhava*, etc. is not fixed. The terms used in the allegory of the seed and that of reaching the further shore of the *samudda* (ocean) are seen gradually to acquire a technical significance. This *sutta* furnishes a great deal of data for the development of early Buddhist terminology. All the available evidence from doctrinal grounds too shows that the *sutta* appears early.

## 48

**External evidence.**—References made to the *Muni Sutta* in other works show that the *sutta* was known before the compilation of these respective works. The *Muni-gāthā* are mentioned as one of the sections recited by Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa at *Divy.* 20, and by the merchants at *Divy.* 35. The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and the Tibetan *Dulva* include the *Muni-gāthā* among the sections recited by Śroṇa.<sup>33</sup> As Rhys Davids<sup>34</sup> has pointed out, by *Muni-gāthā* was meant the *Muni Sutta*. In one of the places where *Milp.* (i.e. p. 385) quotes the opening stanza of the *Muni Sutta* (i.e. *Sn.* 207) the name of the *sutta* itself is not mentioned, though reference is made to the *Sutta Nipāta*, (see note 6). Usually the author of *Milp.* refers to the whole work rather than to a particular *sutta* when he makes his quotations; e.g. *Samyuttanikāyavare*, *Suttanipāte*, etc. Altogether he makes five references to *Sn.* in quoting stanzas taken from it.<sup>35</sup> There are other quotations from *Sn.* with no references to it whatsoever, and at one place (*Milp.* 36) he quotes *Sn.* 184 and acknowledges it as a stanza of the *Samyuttanikāya* (S.I. 214). It is only in one instance (*Milp.* 369) that a *sutta* in *Sn.* is mentioned by name; viz. in quoting *Sn.* 29 he says, *Vuttam' p'etaṃ Mahārāja, Bhagavatā devâtidevena Suttanipāte*

31. *PBR* 1, 3, p. 146.

32. *ibid.* See also the introduction to the *Pārāyana Vagga*.

33. Sylvan Lévi, *J.A.*, 1915, p. 401 ff.

34. Rhys Davids. *J.P.T.S.*, 1896, p. 95.

35. viz. *Milp.* 369, 385, 411, 413-414, and 414.

*Dhaniyagopālakasutte*. Now, the only occurrence of *Sn.* 207 in the whole work is as the opening verse of the *Muni Sutta*, and it may be said with certainty that the author of *Milp.* knew the *Muni Sutta* as belonging to *Sn.* Although *Milp.* is a comparatively late work (cc. 80 B.C.),<sup>36</sup> all these quotations show that *Sn.* was perhaps known to its author as it is found to-day.

The earlier inscriptional evidence from the Bhābru Minor Rock Edict of Aśoka shows that the *Muni Sutta* was a popular piece even as early as the third century B.C. The fact that the Pāli versions of the episode of Soṇa do not include the *Muni Sutta* among the pieces recited by him does not in any way prove that the *sutta* was not known to the compilers of these respective works. It is only in the more enlarged versions of the episode that the *Muni Sutta* as well as other well known sections of the Scriptures are mentioned. However, the testimony of the Bhābru edict is sufficient to show that the *sutta* was known in comparatively early times.

The indirect evidence from the position of the *sutta* in the *vagga* has been discussed earlier. Yet, it should be observed that the inclusion of the *Muni Sutta* in *Sn.* had taken place at least a good many years before the final edition of *Milp.* Thus, all these isolated references to *Muni-gāthā* and quotations from the *Muni Sutta* strongly support the internal evidence from all sources to establish that the *sutta* is of great antiquity.

(Continued)

---

36. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Outlines of Buddhism*, p. 103.



# A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUTTA NIPATA

N. A. Jayawickrama

## Five Suttas of Popular Character

48

### Parābhava Sutta

The *Parābhava Sutta* and the four other *suttas* which are discussed here belong to a stratum of popular Buddhism, and they emphasise the practical side of Buddhism, laying down secular advice. The *Parābhava Sutta* is presented as a dialogue between a deity and the Buddha wherein *parā+√bhū* the causes for men's downfall are enumerated by the Buddha (*parā+√bhū*: defeat). Though there is no deep philosophy underlying this *sutta* its advice is based on high ethical principles. The vices and evils denounced by Buddhist and contemporary Indian society are portrayed here as in the *Vasala Sutta*. It not only reflects the attitude of the age towards social evils such as the lack of filial piety, disrespect for elders and virtuous men, miserliness, arrogance, addiction to wine, women, and gambling and general unchastity, but also serves as an index to what was considered wrong in man's dealings with other men right down the ages in Indian society. These very sentiments are expressed and repeated over and over in numerous other works of Indian literature, especially the *Dharmaśāstras* and *Dharmasūtras*, and the *sutta* is characteristically Indian but not merely Buddhist. The highly ethical basis underlying the *sutta* runs through the whole poem. The *Mahāmaṅgala Sutta* which lays down in the form of "Blessings" the good qualities one should practise is more Buddhist in its values than this *sutta*, though the two poems taken together are complementary to each other as they are based on the same ethical principles. The fact that this poem was meant for the common man is seen clearly from the last *pāda* of the concluding stanza, which speaks of a *sivam lokam* as opposed to *sivam padam*, the synonym for *Nibbāna*. The word *ariya* (Sn. 1150) has a wider application than the normal Buddhist term.

The language of the *sutta* is generally archaic. The noteworthy peculiarities are:—the historical infinitive *puṭṭhum* (Sn. 91c), the historical ppr. gen. sg. *parābhavato* in the refrain, the adjectival form-*vi jāno* (Sn. 92ab), the word *bhavam* ("worthy"—Sn. 92a) used as in (Skr. *bhavān*), the primary adjective *dessī* (*√dviṣ*—Sn. 92d), the verb *roceti* (Sn. 94c) formed after verbs of Class X, the agent noun *anuṭṭhātā* (Sn. 96b), the dialectical

form *pahu* in the phrase *pahu santo* (being able or capable of *pra*+√*bhū*, Sn. 98c, cp. *pahuta* Sn. 102a, etc. and in frequent use in the Canon, specially in cpds.), the shorter form *saṃ*-in the cpd. *saññātiṃ* (Sn. 104c, cp. Skr. *svaṃ*—besides *svaka*, P. *saka*, also cp. *schī*—Sn. 108a; *saṃ* and *sehi* are poetical forms rather than dialectical variations), the contracted dialectical form *poso* (Sn. 110a; vide Geiger§ 30.3), the contracted form *issā* (Sn. 110c), the verb *supati* (Sn. 110c, cp. *supina*—Sn. 360, etc.) and the uncontracted verb of Class X, *patthayati* (Sn. 114c). All these forms show that the language of the *sutta* is rather old. It is also evident that there is an abundance of pure poetical forms as distinct from the normal canonical idiom and that the diction of the whole *sutta* is highly poetic. The poetical forms of interest are:—*dhammadessī* (Sn. 92d), *kodhapaññāṇo* (Sn. 96c), *timbarutthanī* (Sn. 110b), etc. The verb interposed between the substantive and the adjective, e.g. *lokaṃ bhajate sivaṃ* (Sn. 115d), *khattiye jāyate kule* (Sn. 114b) etc., the disjunctive employed between the substantive and the adjective e.g. *purisaṃ vā pi tādisaṃ* (Sn. 112b) or even the position of the demonstrative adjective in the refrain of the stanzas attributed to the Bhagavā, i.e. *paṭhamo so parābhavo*, etc. are all characteristic of the poetic language.

The style of the *sutta* is neither heavy nor ornate. Though the stanzas are highly antithetical, their style is swift and vigorous. Poetical devices such as simile, metaphor or pun are few, and in fact there is only one metaphor in the whole poem: i.e. Sn. 110b. No definite inference can be drawn from the metre of this poem. The 25 stanzas are in *Anuṣṭubh Śloka*. There is *anacrusis* in Sn. 91c and even quarters of the *Vipulā*-type are found at Sn. 91a, 102a, 110ac, 112a and 114c.<sup>1</sup> The vigorous *Śloka* metre is best adapted to narrative or dialogue ballads. Doctrinal Developments here are almost negligible, but the word *anuṭṭhātā* reminds one of the positive concept *uṭṭhānaviriya*, a term of early doctrinal import. All the available evidence from language, style and metre suggests an early date for the *sutta*. The archaic language rich in historical forms, both verbal and nominal and containing dialectical variations, the free and easy style and the old poetic diction unmarred by any artificial poetic devices are in full accord with its early origin.

External Evidence may yield some data regarding a relative date. The comprehensive code of Moral Law promulgated by Asoka has a great deal in common with the *Parābhava*, *Vasala* and *Maṅgala Suttas*. Although Mookerji<sup>2</sup> is emphatic that Asoka's "Dharma" was not Buddhism but his own ethical philosophy, the strange similarity of ideas in his code

1. Helmer Smith, Sn.A. 640-641.

2. Rādhakumud Mookerji, *Asoka*, p. 68, Gackwad Lectures, 1928.



of ethics and in these *suttas* is conclusive evidence of the connection between the two. Seeing how far he is influenced by Buddhism and Buddhist literature the inference that he based his code on *suttas* such as these are similar literature is quite justifiable. The fact that Asoka not only is acquainted with the ideas here, but also inculcates them is proof of the popularity of secular ethics of this type.

49

### Vasala Sutta

The position of the *Vasala Sutta* in the *vagga* immediately after the *Parābhava Sutta* leads one to the natural inference that an attempt has been made at an arrangement of the *suttas* according to their subject-matter. Such instances are quite frequent in the Canon. The two *suttas*, *Parābhava* and *Vasala* agree with each other in subject-matter, style, language and metre while the two differ in details regarding the outward form. The *Vasala Sutta* falls into the ‘*Ākhyāna*’-class, though the *Parābhava Sutta* cannot be strictly called so. The *gāthas* of the former can form an independent *sutta* without the brahmin being introduced to it at all, but the latter is a pure dialogue like the *Kasibhāradvāja Sutta*. In contents the two *suttas* agree very closely. Lack of filial affections is deplored in identical words (*Sn.* 98, 124) and so is deception practised on brahmins and holy men (*Sn.* 100, 129). The four major evils of killing, stealing, falsehood and adultery are condemned in *Sn.* 117-123 (*Vasala*). Falsehood is referred to in *Sn.* 100 and adultery in *Sn.* 108 (*Parābhava*). Both poems deal with anger (*Sn.* 96, 116, 133), pride and arrogance (*Sn.* 104, 132), miserliness and lack of hospitality (*Sn.* 102, 128, 130) and various other social evils. The same subject is dealt with in identical words in two instances (quoted above—*Sn.* 98, 124; 100, 129). The *Vasala Sutta* deals more fully and in a more comprehensive manner with most of the subjects taken up in the *Parābhava Sutta*; and mentions more vices and evil practices than the latter. Though both *suttas* are true to the spirit of early Indian ethics, the *Vasala Sutta* goes a step further in emphasising that one’s own actions alone qualify one for condemnation and not one’s birth (*jāti*). The *gāthā*,

*Na jaccā vaśalo hoti, na jaccā hoti brāhmaṇo  
kammanā vaśalo hoti, kammanā hoti brāhmaṇo.*

(Not ‘by birth does one become an outcaste or a brahmin, but by one’s action one becomes an outcaste or a brahmin’) occurs twice in the *sutta*, and an illustrative anecdote is appended. The *gāthā* clearly conveys the Buddhist attitude to caste and the note struck here is truly Buddhistic.

The *sutta* itself can be divided into four parts:-

- I. The prose introduction the prelude to the *sutta*.
- II. The body of the *sutta* (Sn. 116-136) containing the aphoristic sayings dealing with the various vices and evil practices.
- III. The short dissertation on *kamma* (action) including the colourful illustration of Mātanga.
- IV. Aggikabhāradvāja's confession of faith in prose, forming the conclusion of the *sutta*.

### Observations:

The *sutta* can retain its characteristics and form a coherent whole without parts, I, III and IV and yet be called *Vasala Sutta*. Sn. 136 appears as a crescendo and concluding verse of the *sutta*. This is further strengthened by Sn. 135 which, in addition to its extra *pādas* sums up the categories of *vasalas* in its last line,

*Ete kho vasalā vuttā, mayā vo ye pakāsitā*

(These whom I have declared unto you are *vasalas*). This summing up may be compared with Sn. 269, the concluding *gāthā* of the *Mahāmaṅgala Sutta*. In both instances the refrain occurs up to the *gāthā* immediately preceding the respective stanzas, and thus Sn. 135 provides a suitable conclusion to the *sutta*. The next stanza too, which in a dramatic manner breaks down the age-old barrier of caste and attributes baseness to base actions rather than to birth, probably belonged to the original *sutta*. The illustration (*nidassana*) that follows appears as a separate *sutta* or as a separate section appended to the *sutta* at a subsequent date. The position of these six stanzas at the end of the *sutta* makes this suggestion very plausible. The repetition of Sn. 136 at Sn. 142 is merely for the purpose of emphasising this essentially Buddhist aphorism. It also provides a suitable climax to the enhanced *sutta*.

There is no doubt that the episode of Mātanga is borrowed from popular tradition. The story Mātanga occurs in the *Anuśāsanika-parvan* of the *Mahābhārata* (Mbh. XIII, 3, 198 ff), but it differs considerably in details from that in Sn. Both Sn. and Mbh. agree on his lowly birth (*Caṇḍālayon-yāṃ jāto*, Mbh, XIII, 3, 198). The outline of the legend in Mbh. is:— “Mātanga, son of a brāhmaṇi was informed by a she-ass that he was in reality a *caṇḍāla*, and in vain tried by way of penance to become a brahmin; at last he succeeded in becoming Candodeva”.<sup>3</sup> The existence of a parallel legend in Mbh. need not necessarily imply that either was based on the other. The probability is that both versions go back to an earlier

3. s.v. Sørensen, Index to the Names in *Mahābhārata*.



tradition (probably oral) and the two as they are, represent parallel developments. (Also cp. *Mātanga Jātaka*).

On the other hand, the position of *Sn.* 124 and 129 seems different. The topic under discussion in *Sn.* 125 is cruelty by word or deed to one's own kith and kin. It seems probable that the connected idea of not supporting one's aged parents has been transported here, and the stanza borrowed wholesale. Similarly, *Sn.* 129 appears as an interpolation. The stanza that immediately precedes it (*Sn.* 128) denounces the action of the person who does not return hospitality to his erstwhile host; and the stanza that follows it (*Sn.* 130) condemns the person who, instead of feeding them abuses brahmins or *samaṇas* who come to his door at meal-time. Both these stanzas deal with the feeding of guests or mendicants, but *Sn.* 129 speaks of the deception practised on mendicants, religious or otherwise, by uttering falsehood. Although *Sn.* 129 disturbs the logical trend of the two stanzas on either side of it, the occurrence of the phrase, *yo brāhmaṇaṃ vā samaṇaṃ vā* in *Sn.* 130 seems to have been considered sufficient reason to introduce *Sn.* 129 which incidentally begins with the same phrase. The inference that *Sn.* 124 and 129 are interpolations implies that the *Parābhava Sutta* is earlier than the *Vasala Sutta*. This need not necessarily be so. The only legitimate conclusion is that the final redaction of the latter took place after the composition of the former. The position of these two stanzas in the two *suttas* sheds some light on this point. In the *Parābhava Sutta*, these two stanzas dealing with similar topics, occur as consecutive answers given by the Bhagavā, whereas in the *Vasala Sutta* they are separated by four other stanzas, two of which (i.e. *Sn.* 126, 127) deal with a different topic altogether.

The similarity of ideas in the two poems does not call for particular attention on account of the fact that they deal with practically the same subject. Language, style, metre and syntax too do not help in determining the age of the two poems in relation to each other. It is solely on the data provided by these two stanzas and the occurrence of the illustrative episode of *Mātanga*, (when the *sutta* proper could end at *Sn.* 135ef where the categories of *vasalas* are summed up, or at *Sn.* 136 which provides a fitting climax) it can be said that the *sutta* may have undergone a change at the hands of a subsequent editor. The stanzas *Sn.* 137-142 appear as a subsequent addition made by a later editor. It is quite probable that the earliest form of this *sutta* did not include these six stanzas, *Sn.* 124 and 129, nor perhaps the prose sections. Judging from internal and external evidence the earliest versions of both *suttas* appear contemporary.

As stated earlier the language of the *gāthās* is quite similar to that of the *Parābhava Sutta*. There are old historical forms like the opt. 3 sg. *jaññā*



(Sn. 116d-134d), the denominative *mamāyitaṃ* (Sn. 119b), shorter inst. sg. *theyyā* (Sn. 119c—Vedic *steya* nt.), the ppr. pass, *cujjamāno* (Sn. 120b), the contracted verb *ādeti* (Sn. 121c) besides *ādiyati* (Sn. 119c) the absolutive *bhutvāna* (Sn. 128b—also poetical), the ppr. medial of the desiderative *nijigimsāno* (Sn. 131c), the pronom. adj. inst, sg. *sena* (Skr. *svena*, cp. *saṃ* Sn. 104c, *sehi* Sn. 108a, 132c), the inst. sgg. *jaccā* (Sn. 136ab, 142ab), *duggaccā* (Sn. 141d), *kammanā* (Sn. 136cd, 142cd) and *aminā* (Sn. 137a cp. also *amunā*) and 3 pl. A. pada *upadissare* (Sn. 140d). Besides the poetical forms like *bhutvāna*, *upadissare*, *sena*, etc. there occur in this sutta as in the previous one many cpds. e.g. *pāpamakkhī* (Sn. 116b), *vipannadiṭṭhi* (Sn. 116c), *paṭicchannakammanto* (Sn. 127c), etc. The sutta preserves the old Pāli idiom, e.g. *pāṇe dayā*, (Sn. 117c), *yaṃ paresaṃ mamāyitaṃ* (Sn. 119b), etc. Often the same idiom, is seen to occur in canonical prose, e.g. *attaheṭu*, *paraheṭu*, *dhanahetu*. . (Sn. 122ab), *akincikkhakamyatā* (Sn. 121a, cp. *lābhakamyatā*). There is an irregular acc. sg. of the ppr. *vajataṃ* (Sn. 121b, v.1. *vajantaṃ* vide Geiger, §130; the Comy. explains it as *gacchantaṃ*—SnA. 179). There is also an abundance of Vedic enclitics like *ve* and *ha-ve* (*vai* and *ha vai*). All these characteristics of old Pāli and the general diction of the poem which is archaic suggest an early for the sutta.

The Style and metre of the poem are similar to those of the *Parābhāva Sutta*. The metrical irregularities are few; i.e. *odd* quarters at Sn. 118a, 121a and 123c and an *even pāda* at Sn. 124c.<sup>4</sup> Evidence from language, style and metre shows that the two poems are contemporary, though on careful examination some parts of the *Vasala Sutta* appear to be younger than the *Parābhava Sutta*.

No doctrinal developments as such are noticeable in the sutta. However in spirit it is more Buddhistic than the former. The four major evils of killing, stealing adultery and falsehood have already been noticed to occur in Sn. 117-123, in same order as the first four precepts, in addition to the other allied misdeeds as highway robbery and plunder. In spite of the popular nature of the sutta the occurrence of the two terms, *diṭṭheva dhamme* and *sampāraye* (Sn. 141ab) suggests some development in Buddhistic ideas; but these terms are of no great value as they are equally common in early Indian literature. The words *vipannadiṭṭhi* (Sn. 116c), *moha* (Sn. 131b), *arahā* and *anarahā* (Sn. 135ab) are not used in their specialized meaning as found in Buddhism. It is significant that Sn. 134b speaks of the *sāvakas* and not of the *Saṅgha*, and it is probable that this sutta is quite distinct from monastic Buddhism. The phrase *khattiyā brāhmanā* in Sn. 138, like the canonical phrase *samaṇa-brāhmanā*, unconsciously suggests the order of precedence as the Buddhists conceived

4. Helmer Smith, *ibid*.



it,<sup>5</sup> though the *sutta* itself repudiates the stigma attached to low birth. The mention of *devayāna*, the path leading to the *devas* in *Sn.* 139 shows to some extent how far the *sutta* echoes the then-current Indian thought. It is clear that the goal aimed at is *brahmaloka*. The earlier Upanisads<sup>6</sup> mention the two paths by which a departed soul proceeds to enjoy the fruits of his actions. They are the *devayāna* or the *arcirmārga* the path of light leading to the plane of Brahmā or *satyaloka* and the *pitryāna* or the *dhūmamārga*, the path of darkness leading to the region of the moon or *candraloka*. When Indian thought evolved and gradually established the identity of Self with Brahman, *devayāna* became the path leading to the union with the Highest.<sup>7</sup> It is not clear what stage of development in Indian thought *Sn.* 139 reflects, yet the final goal mentioned is *brahmaloka*. Perhaps *sivam lokam* (the world of happiness at *Sn.* 115) also refers to the same state.<sup>8</sup> The Commentator rightly interprets it as *devalokam* (*Sn.A.* 173). Both these references show that these poems are not doctrinal dissertations but *suttas* meant for the inculcation of popular ethics.

All the available external evidence too shows that the *sutta* belongs to the realm of popular ethics. It contains ideas common with the Epics and other Sanskrit literature. *Sn.* 122 may be compared with *Manu.* VIII, 13; *Sn.* 128 with *Mbh.* XIII, 126; 27; and *Taittiriyaśikṣāvallī* 11, 2; and *Sn.* 135 with *Manu.* X, 12; 16 and 26, etc. The observations made with reference to the *Parābhava Sutta* that Asoka's moral code apply here too. The *gāthās* appear to be very old in the light of internal evidence and the testimony from the Edicts suggests that they should be at least pre-Asokan.

## 50

**Mahāmaṅgala Sutta**

It has already been stated that the *Mahāmaṅgala Sutta* (also known as the *Maṅgala Sutta*) is complementary to the *Parābhava Sutta*. Both *suttas* contain a short prose introduction with identical words, and a *devatā* is introduced as the Buddha's interlocutor. The only difference in form, between the two *suttas* is that the *Maṅgala Sutta* unlike the other, is not a proper dialogue, for, the *devatā* is represented as asking only one question to which the Buddha gives an uninterrupted reply. The two *suttas* categorically state the various factors which lead to one's downfall and which are considered as blessings respectively, and conclude didactically summing up the enumeration. A regular feature in the poems is the

5. The sequence *Khattiyā, Brāhmaṇā, Vessā, Suddā* occurs many times in *M.* and *D.*

6. *Brhadāranyaka Upanisad*, VI. 2, 2; IV. 11, etc.

7. Also *vide* Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, Vol. I, pp. 252-255.

8. As stated earlier, this term cannot refer to *nibbāna* as the mention of a "*nibbāna-loka*" anywhere in the Canon. It is either *nibbana pada* or *nibbāna dhātu*.



refrain which is a feature in the greater part of the *Vasala Sutta*. The *sutta* lays emphasis on good living and gives practical advice. It is essentially didactic like the gnomic poetry of the Sanskrit literature. The word *maṅgala* conveyed to the brahmins anything that was considered as auspicious. In every society, whether past or present, Occidental or Oriental, there are certain beliefs and superstitions to which people attach some importance in varying degrees. *Maṅgala* to a brahmanical society in ancient India represented all the sights and sounds, actions, ritual and ceremonies which they deemed holy or auspicious. In this *sutta* the Buddha is seen giving a new value to the term *maṅgala* employing it to stress the importance of a righteous living. The *sutta* does not attempt to teach anything new, but inculcates in a different form the ethical principles already known to the Indians. There is no deep philosophy underlying the *sutta*, yet it has to some extent a Buddhist background. The theme, *kālēna dhamma savaṇaṃ* (Sn. 265c, listening to the *dhamma* at the proper time) *kālēna dhamma-sākaṇṇa* (Sn. 266c, religious discussions at the proper time), *samaṇānaṃ ca dassanaṃ* (Sn. 266b, paying homage to the monks), *ariyasaccāna dassanaṃ* (Sn. 267b, an insight into the *ariyan*-noble truths) and *nibbānasacchikiriya* (Sn. 267b, the realization of *nibbāna*) are decidedly of Buddhist application though *dhammacariyā* (Sn. 263a, living in accordance with the *dhamma*), *appamādo ca dhammesu* (Sn. 264c, perseverance in doing good deeds) and *patirūpadesavāsa* (Sn. 200a, living in a suitable region) are capable of being given a wider interpretation than suggested by the Commentator (Pj. I. 123-157). The perfect balance of mind under all conflicting circumstances. (Sn. 268) is again a characteristically Buddhist concept. The *sutta* thus is essentially Buddhist although it deals with popular ethics.

This *sutta* occurs *verbatim* in the *Khuddaka-pāṭha* and the *Paritta-pāṭha*.<sup>9</sup> It is also one of the *Tun-sūtraya* (the Three Suttas, the other two being *Ratana* and *Metta Suttas*), used at *Pirit* ceremonies; which shows that the *sutta* has enjoyed great popularity from comparatively early times (when the *Khp.* was compiled); up to the present day.<sup>10</sup> There is a *jātaka* known

9. The *Paritta-pāṭha* is a collection of suttas varying in number from 28 to 32, taken from various parts of the Canon. It is known in Ceylon as the *Pirit-pota* (the Book of Pirit). Also *vide* Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, p. 80.

10. *Khp.* as a collection cannot be of very early date. From the negative evidence that no mention of it is made in the Canon or in *Miln.* it may be inferred that it came into being sometimes later, though argument from silence is not always very satisfactory evidence. On the other hand, *Miln.* mentions Sn. by name (*vide* U.C.R. Vol. VII, 3), and it is quite probable that the author of *Miln.* knew Sn. as it exists to-day. *Miln.* 349 mentions *Khuddaka-bhāṇakā*, but this is no evidence for the existence of *Khp.* It only refers to a collection of minor pieces, probably the greater part of what is now known as *Khuddaka Nikāya*, just in the same way as *Dīgha* or *Majjhima-bhāṇakā* referred to the reciters of long or medium sized suttas which were invariably included in the *Dīgha* and *Majjhima Nikāyas* respectively. Thus, the earliest collection in which *Maṅgala Sutta* was included is probably Sn. though it may have existed earlier as an individual *sutta*.



as the *Mahāmaṅgala Jātaka* (No. 453) which the Commentator (J. IV, 72-73) associates with the *Maṅgala Sutta* and quotes the opening *pāda* of the *devatā*'s question mentioning that the total number of *maṅgalas* enumerated in the *sutta* is 38; but it has no connection whatsoever with the present *sutta*, and it is in reality a dissertation on happiness in accordance with Brahmanical ideas of life rather than Buddhistic principles.

There are no specific linguistic forms in the *sutta* that may be classed as very ancient, nor are there signs of lateness in the language. It is the normal Gāthā-Pāli idiom with the usual poetic diction. The stanzas are highly rhythmical and melodious. There is no involved syntax and the language is simple. The few linguistic forms which call for attention are:—*acintayum* (Sn. 258b) the historical Aorist 3 pl., *sotthānam* (Sn. 258c) acc. sg. of *sotthāna* nt. cp. Skr. *svastyayana*, *sovacassatā* (Sn. 266a) abstract of the secondary form from *su-vacas* and the usage of *dassanam* (Sn. 266b, 267b) in its literal and applied meanings of visiting to pay homage and unsight into (vision of), respectively. The phrases *mātāpitu-upaṭṭhānam* (Sn. 262a), *ariyasaccāna-dassanam* (Sn. 267b) and *sabbattha-m-aparājitā* (Sn. 269b) betray the flexibility of *sandhi* in Pali, specially in metrical exigencies. The metre of the poem is *Anuṣṭubh Śloka*, and the few metrical irregularities are: one instance of *anacrusis* at Sn. 260a and two instances of *even quarters* at Sn. 260c and 265c. The *sutta* contains a few special Buddhistic terms in addition to those that are in common with contemporary Indian religious systems. *Ariyasaccāna-dassanam* (Sn. 267b) is a definite reference to the Noble Truths of Buddhism, and *nibbānasacchikiriyā* (Sn. 267c) is the attainment consequent on the obtaining of an insight into the *Ariyan* Truths. Other concepts such as *tapo* (ascetic practices) *brahmacariyā* (celibacy) Sn. 267a, *attasammāpanidhi* (a thorough development of personality—Sn. 260c), *khanti* (forbearance—Sn. 266a) etc. are of general Indian origin and therefore are of no special importance.

External Evidence consists mainly of a comparison with the Moral Law of Asoka promulgated in the Edicts. Asoka's *dharma*, like the sayings in the three *suttas*, *Vasala*, *Parābhava* and *Maṅgala*, is not any religious system peculiar to one sect or school, but contains practical and doctrinal advice embracing the various relations of life. However, a close comparison shows that Asoka had drawn his material from a literature very similar to these *suttas*. From his acquaintance with certain parts of the Canon i.e. the seven *Dharmaparyāyas* some of which have been traced to Sn. (vide PBR, 1, 3, p. 137) it may be inferred that he was equally acquainted with these *suttas*. The following table<sup>11</sup> shows to what extent the contents of these *suttas* can be compared with Asoka's *dharma*:

11. This table is based on Radhakumud Mookerji's analysis of the Moral Law of Asoka in his *Gaekwad Lectures*, pp. 69 ff.

## Asoka:

## Sutta Nipāta:

1. Obedience to (a) elders R.E. IV,<sup>12</sup> (*anupratī paṭīpati*) P.E. VII, (b) teachers R.E. XIII, P.E. VII. Sn. 259b, *paṇḍitānaṃ ca sevānā*.
2. Respect (a) of pupils-*antevāsī*-towards their *gurūs* M.R.E. II, (b) towards *gurūs* R.E. IX. Sn. 259c, *pūjā ca pūjaneyyānaṃ*.  
265a, *gāravo*.
3. Proper treatment towards (a) ascetics, both *brāhmaṇa* and *samaṇa* R.E. IV, P.E. VII, (b) relations M.R.E. II, R.E. IV, XIII. Sn. 100, 129, 130.  
Sn. 98--124, 102, 104c, 125.
4. Charity (*dānaṃ*) R.E. III, VII, VIII, IX, XI. Sn. 263a, 102c.
5. Abstention from slaughter of and violence towards living beings, R.E. III, IV, XI, P.E. VII, R.E. IX, IV, P.E. VIII, R.E. XIII, M.R.E. II, cp. R.E. III, IV, IX, XI, XIII and P.E. VII. Sn. 117-118.
6. Kindness (*dayā*) P.E. II, VII. Cp. *Metta Sutta*, Sn. 143-153.
7. Truthfulness (*satyaṃ*) M.R.E. II, P.E. II, VII. Sn. 122c, 100c, 129c.
8. Gentleness (*mārdavaṃ*) R.E. XIII, P.E. VII. Sn. 143d.
9. Gratitude (*kṛtajñatā*) R.E. VII. Sn. 265b.
10. Attachment to *dharma* (Asokan morality) R.E. XIII. Sn. 92c, 263a, 264c, 265c, 266c.
- 11 Purity of heart (*bhāva śuddhi*) R.E. VII. Sn. 260c, cp. *yakkhassa suddhi* Sn. 478, 876.

Of the requisite qualities mentioned in P.E. I for the attainment of happiness in this world and the next, *dharma-kāmatā* occupies the first place (No. 10 in Table). *Suśrūṣī* (obedience), No. 1 in table *bhaya* (fear to do wrong—cp. *ottappa* in Pāli, Sn. 133c, etc.), and *utsāha* (effort—cp. *uṭṭhānaviriya*, see *anuttathā*, Sn. 96b) are three others. In R.E. XIII Asoka summarises his 'Dharma' as 1. *Akṣati* (non-injury—cp. Sn. 117-118) 2. *saṃyama* (restraint quite frequent in the *Muni-Ballads* of Sn. cp. Sn. 264, etc.) 3. *samācaraṇaṃ* (impartiality) and *mārdavaṃ* (gentleness; No. 8 in table). On these and numerous other points (enumerated by Mookerji, *Asoka*, pp. 69-78) Asoka's 'Dharma' bears a strong resemblance to the

12. R.E.: Rock Edict, P.E.: Pillar Edict, M.R.E.: Minor Rock Edict.



ideology of these *suttas*. Although one may not be quite certain of the existence of *Sn.* as a collection in Asoka's time, there is no doubt that many of the *suttas* constituting *Sn.* were anterior to Asoka. It has already been noticed that Asoka had been influenced by a literature quite similar to these popular ethics. The internal evidence reveals that the *suttas* are old, and that they preserve definite characteristics of the poetic language which probably preceded the standardised canonical Pali prose. It is thus highly probable that these *suttas* were known to Asoka.

## 51

### Metta Sutta

The *Metta Sutta*, another member of the triad of *suttas*, is also found in *Khp.* as No. 9. The Commentator's introduction which is historically of a lower level of interpretation states that the *sutta* was preached by the Buddha as a topic of meditation to monks and to serve the purpose of a *paritta* to ward off dangers arising from evil spirits (*Pj.* I. 231-232). There is no doubt that the *sutta* provided a useful topic of meditation for both monks and laymen, and in subsequent years, even as early as the commentarial epoch, or perhaps earlier, it was used as a *paritta*. Its inclusion in *Khp.*, a handbook of popular Buddhism, indicates that this *sutta*, like its two companion *suttas*, was very popular from comparatively early times. The *sutta* inculcates the practice of *mettā* (amity, or love to all beings). The theme is an early tenet of Buddhism and the idea corresponds to *dayā* of the Sanskrit epics and other allied literature. Even before the four *Brahma-vihāras* were fixed and standardised the term *mettā* is to be met with in association with such concepts as *upekhā*, *karuṇā*, *vimutti* and *muditā* (*Sn.* 73). The theme is developed from various aspects in the *sutta*:—(a) Wishing happiness and well-being to all creatures irrespective of their size or form or stage of growth (*bhūtā vā saṃbhavesī vā*: creatures come into being or in their embryonic state, *Sn.* 147c). (b) The negative aspect of the absence of ill-will towards them (*Sn.* 148). (c) The development of boundless thoughts of love, as deep as maternal affection to all creatures (*Sn.* 149). (d) The diffusion of unobstructed thoughts of loving kindness in all directions at all times (*Sn.* 149-150). It is extolled as the *brahma-vihāra*—the highest abiding<sup>13</sup> (*Sn.* 151). The 10 opening lines of the *sutta* are of an introductory nature. They describe the *atthakusala*—he who is bent on his welfare. Though *santam padam*—tranquilled state (*Sn.* 143)—need not necessarily always signify *nibbāna*, the qualifying

13. Mrs. Rhys Davids (in "What was the Original Gospel of Buddhism?") thinks that this line preserves "a metrical legacy" of the disciples of an unknown Brahmin teacher, and sees God in the epithet *brahma*. She translates *Sn.* 151d as, "God have they here this living called".



remark that the *atthakusala* should be detached from family life (Sn. 144d) suggests that the poem was primarily meant for the monks. A descriptive classification of creatures is made at Sn. 146 and another mutually exhaustive and more precise division at Sn. 147c<sup>14</sup>. The development of a mental attitude (*mānasam bhāvayati*, cp. Sn. 149d, 150b) consisting of the thoughts of love is the keynote of the poem and it concludes with an exhortation to make an end of birth (Sn. 152d).

As far as linguistic evidence goes what has been said of the other *suttas* applies here too. There is ellipsis in the opening stanza of the *sutta* (Sn. 143). The form *addiṭṭhā* at Sn. 147a has *-dd-* either *metri causa* or as a consonantal doubling after the negative prefix; cp. *appasāda*. The indefinite adverb *katthacinaṃ* (Sn. 148b) contains a contamination of two indefinite suffixes *cid* and *cana*. There are two forms with the contraction of the final *-āya>-ā* viz. *vyārosanā* and *paṭighasaññā*: (Sn. 148c). The regular form *niya* for Vedic *nija* (also P. *nija*) through Prakrit *nia* (vide Geiger § 36) occurs. Besides these there are other forms *sayāno* (Sn. 151b) historical ppr. medial, the affirmative particle *jātu* (Sn. 152d) which is practically confined to poetry, Vedic forms as *āyusā* (Sn. 149b) and a wealth of optative forms illustrative of various types used in Pali; viz. 3 sg. *assa* (Sn. 143d), 3 sg. *samācare* (Sn. 145a), *anurakkhe* (Sn. 149b), *bhāvaye* (Sn. 149d, 150b), medial 3 sg. *nikubbetha* (Sn. 148a) *iccheyya* (Sn. 148d), *adiṭṭheyya* (Sn. 151c) and 3 pl. *upaddaveyyum* (Sn. 145b). There also occurs an inorganic sandhi at Sn. 151d. viz. *idha-m-āhu*.

The style of the *sutta* is free and easy to a great extent and the ideas are expressed lucidly. The *sutta* being didactic, the greater part of it is explanatory and injunctive. Though it contains two long lists (Sn. 143c-144d, 1461-147d) no laboured effect is produced, as there is an easy flow of words along with its rhythmic effect. There is only one simile in the whole poem (Sn. 149ab) and it appears quite apt, as it emphasises the central theme. The poem is written in a metre described as *Āryā* (*Gīti*) by Helmer Smith.<sup>15</sup> Yet the metre here is not the proper classical *Gīti* or any of its sub-types including *Āryā*. Normally the syllabic instants of the first and third *pādas* of the *Gīti* metres are limited to 12, whereas the other two *pādas* vary from 15 to 18. None of these 10 stanzas corresponds to any of the varieties of the classical *Gīti* metre, and at best what is found here is a very free modification of the *Āryā-Gīti*. The syllabic instants of the *Metta Sutta* vary from 11, 17, 13, 17 in Sn. 152 to 16, 17, 15, 18 in Sn.

14. It is significant that the classification into the five types *jalābuja*, *andaja*, *sam-sedaja* and *opapātika* (viviparous, oviparous, moisture born and of spontaneous birth), a division known to be in use comparatively early in India, does not occur here. It may perhaps indicate that the Buddhist writers had not yet adapted it in their works during the time of these *suttas*, though the classification occurs in prose sections of the Canon (D. III. 230, M. I. 73 S. III, 240, etc.).

15. Op. cit. (Sn.A. 637).



147. In two instances the number of *mātrās* (syllabic instants) in a full stanza is less than 60, in two 60 (the prescribed number in Sanskrit poetics) and in the other six over 60. However it is worth noting that this metre stands “between the more archaic technique of the *śloka-triṣṭubh* and the *jagatīs*, *atijagatīs*, etc, of the late-canonical and semi-canonical compositions”.<sup>16</sup>

Doctrinal developments. In its tone and outlook the *sutta* bears signs of antiquity. The term *atthakusala* (Sn. 143a) probably refers to the *attha* (weal) pertaining to both this world and the next. The emphasis on a life which is beyond the censure of the wise (Sn. 145ab) may suggest that the *attha* was primarily connected with this world. The Commentator, however, interprets *santam padam* (Sn. 143b) as *nibbāna* (Pj. I. 236) merely because the term is used as a synonym for the latter. Yet, the state of mental tranquillity referred to here is capable of a more general interpretation. This is further supported by Sn. 143cd-145ab, which do not apply to one who has attained *nibbāna*: and therefore *attha* should be interpreted as benefit here on earth rather than well-being after death or even *paramattha* the *summum bonum*.

The ideal envisaged in Sn. 144 is that of the ascetic or the *muni*. This certainly reflects early material. The next two lines which allude to public opinion are not wholly inconsistent with the *Muni*-ideal, though as a rule the *muni* is not influenced by the outside world (cp. Sn. 213b, 214b, etc.). This difference in attitude does not imply a later phase of development, nor does it indicate any real departure from the ideal in early Buddhism. The probability is that the *sutta* was meant for a wider circle than ascetics alone, and the authority of the *viññū* had to be reckoned with in preparing one's self for the tranquil-state of mind which would be the basis for the contemplation (*mānasam bhāveti*) on *mettā*. The concept of *mettā* is suggested to be of pre-Buddhistic origin,<sup>17</sup> but Buddhism and its senior contemporary religion Jainism were responsible for the widespread movement of not only non-injury to living things, but the actual practice of amity towards them. The phrase *mānasam bhāveti* (develop a frame of mind; cp. *manīṣā* Rv. X. 129) is not in frequent use in the language, and the word *mānasa* used absolutely is semi-technical in character (s.v., PTS). Neither the concept *mettā* nor the term *mānasa* yields any conclusive data. The two words *diṭṭhi* and *dassana* (Sn. 152) are used as mutually contradictory terms from the earliest times:<sup>18</sup> they are diametrically opposed to each other in their semantic development

16. *Ibid.* Helmer Smith.

17. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *op. cit.*

18. Mrs. Rhys Davids in her translation of Khp. in the Minor Anthologies considers this stanza late for reasons she adduces in her introduction.

though they are derivatives from the same root (*dr̥ś*). There is hardly an instance of *diṭṭhi* being qualified as *sammā* or *micchā* in all the 45 occurrences of the word in *Sn*. The term *diṭṭhi* embraces all philosophical views and speculations which were (perhaps later) designated as *micchādiṭṭhi*, while *dassana* is a more precise concept signifying insight. The latter has no bearing on the question of the difference between *sammādiṭṭhi* and *micchādiṭṭhi*.

External evidence—The only form of external evidence available is the occurrence of similar or parallel ideas in other works. The idea *mettā* occurs frequently in the Canon in the list of *Brahmavihāras*, and also singly in various other contexts, e.g. *mettā ceto-vimutti* at D. I. 251, S.II. 265, A. IV. 150, It. 20, etc., *mettā-sahagatena cetasā* at D. I. 250, etc., S.V. 115, A. I. 138, etc., *mettaṃ cittaṃ* at D. I. 167, III. 237, *Sn*. 507, *Vin*. II. 110, A. II. 72, *Th1*. *Th2*, etc. and *mettā-bhāvanā* at *Miln*. 199. At S. I. 75 Pasenadi Kosala declares to Mallikā that the dearest thing to a person is his own self. At the end of the conversation they go to the Buddha who advises them

*Sabbā disānuparigamma cetasā  
n'ev' ajjhagamā piyataram attanā kvaci,  
evaṃ piyo puthu attā paresaṃ  
tasmā na hiṃse param attakāmo.*

(Having mentally surveyed all directions I have not found anywhere, anything so dear to me as my own self. So is it to the others that each one's self is dear. Therefore let him who loves his own self not bring harm upon another). Cp. *Sn*. 705, *Dh*. 129, 130. Here the standard of judgment in refraining from injury to others is one's love for one's own self. The same idea is reflected in Yajñavalkya's advice to Maitreyi in *Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (*Brh*. II. 4: IV. 5) cp. *Bhg*. VI. 32 which conveys the same idea. A passage occurring at *Mbh*. XI. 7, 1

*Na hy ātmānam priyataraṃ kiñcid bhūteṣu niścitam:  
aniṣtaṃ sarva-bhūtānāṃ maraṇaṃ nāma Bhārata:  
tasmāt sarveṣu bhūteṣu dayā kāryā vipaścitā.*

(Undoubtedly there is nothing so dear to beings as their own selves: indeed, death is most unpleasant to all creatures, O son of Bharata. Therefore let the wise man extend kindness to all creatures) is quite similar to the passage at S.I. 75.

In all these instances the reason adduced for one to refrain from harming others is the love one bears to one's self. On the other hand in the *Metta Sutta* the practice of *mettā* is not prompted by any such motives. It is *mettā* for its own sake. It is not possible to ascertain which idea was



earlier. Though the concept *mettā* occurs frequently in early canonical works *mettā bhāvanī* is scarcely mentioned. As a term *mettā bhāvanā* may be of later growth, yet the idea seems old. The creation of an active mental force (*mānasam*) consisting of thoughts of love is fundamentally the same as *mettā bhāvanā*, and is perhaps the predecessor of the latter term.<sup>19</sup>

## 52

**Ratana Sutta**

The popular character of this poem is seen in the opening lines, *yānīdha bhūtāni* etc. The *bhūtas* (spirits) are addressed and their goodwill (*sumanas*) is invoked. They are requested to extend thoughts of friendliness (*mettam karotha*) to the human race. The naivety and the simplicity of the two opening stanzas are reminiscent of the Vedic hymns. This is specially true of,

*divā ca ratto ca haranti ye balim  
tasmā hi ne rakkhatha appamattā*

(who bring you oblations day and night; therefore protect them arduously). Every word of these two stanzas is full of meaning and of echoes. Although these beings are invoked for protection, the central theme is the exaltation of the *Three Ratanas*, Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha. One may see in this *sutta* a synthesis of popular cults and Buddhism, yet the synthesis is very remote, far from being complete. There is no real adaptation of Buddhism to popular cults and ritual, but on the contrary popular Buddhism has taken for granted a prevalent cult. However, with time there sets in a change and this *sutta* along with many others becomes a *paritta* (a ward-rune) and there-by part and parcel of every-day Buddhism. Its inclusion in the "Three Suttas", the *Piritpota* and the *Khp.* has already been mentioned.

The invocation of blessings in the *sutta* is in the form of a *saccakriyā* (asseveration by truth) viz. *etena saccena suvatthi hotu*. A remarkable feature of the poem is the evidence of a growth of a complete Buddhist doxology. The term *Tathāgata* an epithet often applied to the Buddha, is extended to both the Dhamma and Saṅgha.<sup>20</sup> Seven of the 12 stanzas

19. Miss I. B. Horner in her Review of *Woven Cadences* (Hibbert Journal, October 1945) points out that the formula *uddham adho ca tiriyaṃ* is found only at Sn. 150 in connection with *mettā*. However, it is found in other passages without any reference to *mettā*; e.g. 537, 1055, 1068, etc.

20. The three formulas used in the Buddhist daily prayer in praise of Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha, viz. *Iti' pi so bhagavā-pe-svākkhāto bhagavatā dhammo-pe-and supajipanno bhagavato sāvakasaṅgho-pe-respectively*, culled from the Canon (e.g. D. II. 93 ff., III. 5, A. I. 207 ff., 56 ff., IV. 406 ff., etc.) may be compared with this. Also cp.

*Ye ca Buddhā (dhammā, saṅghā) attitāca,  
ye ca Buddhā (dhammā, saṅghā) anāgatā,  
paccuppannā ca ye Buddhā (dhammā, saṅghā).  
ahaṃ vandāmi sabbadā*



Sn. 224-235 devoted to the Three *Ratanas* are in praise of the third ‘‘Jewel,’’ the Saṅgha. This may probably indicate a conscious effort on the part of the Saṅgha to assert its importance. The members of the Saṅgha are spoken of as the disciples of the *Sugata* who are worthy of offerings (*te dakkhiṇeyyā sugatassa sāvaka*—Sn. 227c). They are the recipients of *dāna* or *yañña* in Brahmanic terminology,<sup>21</sup> and as such form an important factor for man’s acquisition of merit (*anuttaram puññakkhettaṃ lokassa*). It is obvious that the *sutta* reflects a time when there had come into existence an organised coenobitic Saṅgha as opposed to forest dwelling anchorites—*munayo*. The invitation extended to the *bhūtas* to join in the worship of the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha (who are honoured by gods and men—*devamanussapūjita*) not only betrays the popular nature of the *sutta* but shows that its composition had taken place when worship formed an essential factor in the religion.

The *sutta* can be divided into three parts, viz. I. Sn. 222-223, II. Sn. 224-235, and III. Sn. 236-238. Part I forms the introduction which consists of an invitation to the *bhūtas* whose *mettā* is invoked. These are the only stanzas of the poem which resemble the Vedic hymns closely. As in the Vedic hymns (a) the opening lines form the invocation (Sn. 222ab), (b) a request is made for their goodwill (Sn. 222cd), (c) their *mettā* is solicited (223b), (d) they are reminded of services rendered to them (Sn. 223c) and finally (e) their protection is sought. Part II can be further divided into (a) Sn. 224-226 (b) Sn. 227-235. (a) Sn. 226 marks the final stanza said to have been uttered by the Buddha according to one tradition quoted by the Commentator, *Apare pana vadanti: ādito pañc eva gāthā bhagavatā vuttā, sesā parittakaraṇasamaye Anandattherenā ti*. (Others maintain that only the five opening stanzas, viz. Sn. 222-226, were uttered by the Blessed One, and the rest by the Elder Ānanda on the occasion of the *paritta*-recital.—Pj. I. 165). It is interesting to note that up to this point the *Saṅgha* is not mentioned and it is noteworthy that the only other references to an organised Saṅgha in Sn. are at 519d and 1015b (the latter in the late prologue to the *Pārāyaṇa*)<sup>22</sup> Although there may be the possibility of some truth underlying this tradition, Sn. 222-226, by themselves, do not form a satisfactory unit as a *sutta*. On the other hand if Sn. 223 is rejected as a late stanza, since the stanzas corresponding to it in the *Mahāvastu* version occur somewhat later in the *sutta* (i.e. vv. 15-16; *Mvastu*. I. 294), it would be possible to infer that Sn. 227 marks the last stanza of a complete unit, thus partly agreeing with the tradition mentioned above, (b) Seven (i.e. Sn. 227-232, 235) of the nine stanzas in this group are devoted to describe the Saṅgha: and it is apparent from the over

21. C.p Nd. 2. 523

22. There are other references to *nāgasangha* at Sn. 421b and *samaṇasangha* at Sn. 550c in the more general sense of ‘‘multitude’’ as in *devasangha* at Sn. 680c.



emphasis laid on the Saṅgha that this section was one of the so-called 'monastic fabrications'. There are nine consecutive stanzas in *Mvastu*. (Viz. vv. 6-14: *Mvastu*. I. 291-294) with the refrain, *idam pi saṅghe ratanam praṇītam*, etc. Of the other two stanzas, *Sn*. 233 and 234, the former roughly corresponds to v. 15 in *Mvastu*, (I. 294) which runs,

*Grīṣmānamāse prathame, Caitrasmin  
vane pragulmā yatha puṣpitāgrū  
vāteritā te surabhiṃ pravānti  
evaṃvidhaṃ dhyāyino Buddha putrāḥ  
sīlenupetā surabhiṃ pravānti  
idam pi saṅghe ratanam praṇītam  
etena satyena suvasti bhotu  
manuṣyato vā amanuṣyato vā*

The latter (*Sn*. 234) has no parallel in *Mvastu*. From this disparity it may be surmised that the BSK. version was based on different recension of the *sutta* which perhaps was earlier than or contemporaneous with the Pāli. The better arrangement of the expanded version in *Mvastu*. perhaps indicates that as a *sūtra*, it is younger than the version preserved in *Sn*. Part III which consists of the concluding stanzas is attributed neither to the Buddha nor to Ānanda, by the Comy. and tradition, but to Sakka. The last two verses are mere repetitions of *Sn*. 236 with the Dhamma and Saṅgha substituted for the Buddha in line c. It has already been observed that these three stanzas show the development of a complete doxology in Buddhists worship. All the three stanzas are found in a condensed form in the concluding verse in *Mvastu*, (I. 295).

On purely linguistic evidence the *sutta* appears old; but its contents and developments in ideology and doctrine show that it cannot be as old as the earliest *suttas* of *Sn*. Many of the archaic and dialectical forms found in the *sutta* have no exact parallels in *Mvastu*. This is clear evidence that the recension from which the *sūtra* in *Mvastu*. was compiled had lost sight of such old forms, and found them too obscure to restore the equivalent Sanskritised forms. The phrase *divā ca ratto ca* (*Sn*. 223c), though stereotyped, is old; and the younger Pāli would prefer *divā ca rattiyā ca* (both inst.) or *divaṃ ca rattim ca* (both acc.) as in *Mvastu*. *divaṃ ca rātrim ca*. The adverb of place *huraṃ* (*Sn*. 224a, cp. *Th* 1. 10, *Sn*. 486c. 470c, etc.) goes back to the dialect of the Brāhmaṇas.<sup>23</sup> Even though the phrase *sataṃ pasatthā* (*Sn*. 227a) is neither irregular nor particularly archaic *Mvastu*. has *sadā praśastā*. It is quite probable that the recension that *Mvastu*. followed contained the idea *sadā* and not *satām*. In *Mvastu*, the

23. A. V. *huruk* > Brāh. *huras* > P. *huraṃ* (with -am the standard adverbial termination formed after the acc. sg. of nt. nouns). Cp. *hurāhuraṃ* at Dh. 334, *Th* 1. 339, etc. *Mvastu*. has *parasmin* in place of *huraṃ*.

cpd. *suppayuttā* (Sn. 228a) is replaced by *yuktayogī* (cp. *yogayukto munir Bhg.* V. 6), and *laddhā mudhā* by a totally different idea, *vimuktacittā*. Though *mudhā* is met with in Classical Skr. it is an old form. The form *catubbhi* is historical and old (*Mvastu. caturbhi*). The archaic particle *su* (cp. Skr. *svid*) at Sn. 231b in the phrase *tayas su dhammā* is lost in *Mvastu. (trayo 'sya)*; so is *uda* (cp. Vedic *uta*) at Sn. 232b replaced by *atha*. The enclitic *no* in the phrase *na no samam atthi* is perhaps dialectical (*Mvostu. tam*). Similarly pronouns *ye* and *ne* at Sn. 223cd are not only lost in *Mvastu.* but the corresponding lines there,

*divam ca rātrīm ca haranti vo balim*  
*tasmāddhi nam rakṣatha apramattā* (*Mvastu.* I. 294)

are grammatically wrong. The old Māgadhī nom. sg. in *-e* at Sn. 233a cannot be traced in *Mvastu.* which has the plural instead. The cpd. *paramam hitāya* is an old *aluk-samāsa* which has puzzled even the Commentator who explains the nasal as *metri causa*, (*Pj.* I. 192). If that was so *paramā* (*-ā* contraction for *-āya*) which would suit the context better and has the same metrical value is to be expected here.

The style of the *sutta* is simple and the verses are quite vigorous. There are a few similes used e.g. the *inda-khīla*<sup>24</sup> at Sn. 229ab, the forest-grove in summer at Sn. 233ab, etc. Metaphor is not infrequent, e.g. *khīṇabījā* at Sn. 235; etc. The heaping up of the attributes of the Buddha at Sn. 225a, 234ab may be a sign of a more developed style. The language is essentially the poetic diction.

The metre of the poem is *Triṣṭubh*, but there are numerous metrical irregularities such as 17 *Jagatīpādas*, one instance of a *pāda* with caesura after the seventh syllable not being reckoned (Sn. 223a) and a contaminated *pāda* (Sn. 235b) enumerated by Helmer Smith.<sup>25</sup>

There are many points of doctrinal importance in this *sutta*. It is not possible to specify any of them as old or young, but certain trends are noticeable. Both old and more developed concepts lie side by side. *Mettā* has already been discussed (Sn. 223b). The categorical statement that the Buddha, Dhamma and the “uninterrupted *samādhi*” are unique (Sn. 224c, 225c, 226c) shows signs of a developed lore. There is an elaborate theory almost amounting to a dogma discussed in Sn. 227-232. These verses are quite valuable in tracing the Arahant-ideal in Buddhism.<sup>26</sup> Most of what is stated here is found in the older parts of the Canon; yet

24. S.v. PTS. “The post, stake or column of Indra, at or before the city gate; also a large slab of stone let into the ground at the entrance of a house”. Pj. I. 185: *Nagardvāravivinivāranattham ummarābhantare attha vā dasa vā hatthe paṭhavim khaṇitvā ākoti-tassa sārādārumayattambhass’ etaṃ adhivacanam*.

25. Op. cit. (SnA. 683 ff.).

26. Vide Miss I. B. Horner, *Early Buddhist Theory of Man Perfected*.



there appears a slight departure in the method of presentation. The basic tenet of the *ariyasaccāni* occurs at Sn. 229d and 230a. The eight *puggalas* (individuals) culminating with the *Arahant* are mentioned (Sn. 227ab) and there is a probable link with *yoga* in the phrase *suppayuttā* (Sn. 228a.—in perfect control). It is emphasised that these *puggalas* will not enter an eighth existence (Sn. 230d). Further evidence for the development of the concept *Arhant* is to be seen in Sn. 231 where it is stated that the individual (belonging to one of these eight categories) has abandoned *sakkāyadiṭṭhi* “heresy of individuality”, *vicikicchā* “perplexity” and *sīlabbataparāmāsa* “the observance of diverse vows and ascetic practices”. These three concepts represent a somewhat developed phase. As opposed to *vicikicchā* is *saddhā* which signifies a religious aspect rather than a moral relation. The “contagion” of various *silas* and *vatas* may perhaps refer to various types of Brahmanical and other ritual. There also occurs a minor dogma (not found in *Mvastu.*) at Sn. 231e. If these two lines do not belong to a later stratum than the rest of the poem, the term *abhiñhānāni* may also indicate general lateness. The six grievous offences include the five *anantarika kammās* and *aññasatthār’uddesa* (pesiting another teacher—cp. *micchādiṭṭhi*). The latter was probably added to the earlier list of five with the arising of a growing rivalry between the Saṅgha and the members of other sects.’ Further attributes of the *Arahant* occur at Sn. 232. Although *Arahants* are mentioned in the earlier part of the Canon and *arahatta* is a familiar concept, the *sutta* definitely reveals a development in the theory of the *Arahant*. The centre of gravity has already shifted from the *muni* to the “perfect being”. This is the outcome of a widespread monastic organisation as opposed to the “lonely wanderers” of the older ballads.

**External evidence**—A parallel version of this *sutta* occurs at *Mvastu.* I. 290 ff. As stated earlier the two versions in Pali and BSK. may be traced to a common source with different recensions rather than one being based on the other. The evidence discussed above shows that the *sūtra* in *Mvastu.* is relatively younger than the Pali. Though doctrinally the Pali version depicts comparatively developed phase of Buddhism, linguistic and external evidence debars one from assigning a very late date.<sup>27</sup> A passage found at Divy. 340 throws considerable light on both versions of the *sutta*. It runs; *Ayuṣmā Saṅgharaksiteha Nagaropamaṃ sūtraṃ upanikṣiptaṃ gāthāṃ ca bhāṣate,*

*Yāniha bhūtāni samāgatāni  
sthāni bhāmyāṃ athavāntarīkse  
kurantu mātrīm satataṃ prajāsu.  
divā ca rātrau ca carantu dharmam*

27. The *Mvastu.* version, however, is decidedly later than the Pali poem.

The *Nagarūpama Sutta* at A. IV. 106 ff. has no connection whatsoever with the verse quoted, nor with *Mvastu*. I. 290 ff. The stanza may be compared with v. 15 of the *sūtra* in *Mvastu*. (I. 294), lines ab of v. 2 (*Mvastu*. I 290) and *Sn*. 222ab, 223bc. The same idea is found at *Brh*. I. 4, 29 and IV. 3, 43. It is not very probable that *Divy*. 340 quotes from *Mvastu*. or Pali. On the other hand, it may perhaps be attributed to some source which may have been connected with the original version of the *sutta*. The other probability is that the opening verses of the *Ratana Sutta* and the corresponding *gāthās* of *Mvastu*. have drawn upon this stanza, which may have originally belonged to some other section which in all probability was the *Nagarūpama Sūtra* mentioned in *Divy*. (and not the *sutta* bearing that name at A. IV. 106 ff.) This *sutta* seems to have consisted of general advice given in the form of an address made to the *bhūtas*, for, the second line inculcates the practice of *maitrī* and *dharmacaryā*. There is another reference to the Triad of *Ratanas* at *Divy*. 481, in the form of a salutation (*namo ratnatrayāya*), which merely shows that a conception of such a triad was familiar to the editor of that section of *Divy*.

**Indirect evidence**—Internal evidence and all available external evidence show that the *sutta* is comparatively late. It is also found to be decidedly later than the *Muni-Ballads* of *Sn*. It has been observed earlier that subsequent additions are normally made to canonical works by appending them either at the head of a section or at the end of it. The *Ratana Sutta* is clearly an addition made to the *Culla Vagga*, after a *vagga* as such had been formed. Evidence of this nature is not helpful in determining dates of *suttas*, but on the other hand, it is an invaluable source of information in tracing the growth of the various works. It is also useful as a confirmatory test to what has already been discovered from other sources.

**Conclusion**—The supposition that the opening stanzas of the *sutta* in *Sn*. are based on a *sutta* which is now lost leads to the natural inference that the *Ratana Sutta* is of a rather composite nature, being built up of various elements at different periods. Though there is no conclusive evidence forthcoming to establish the tradition, a comparison of the two versions of the *sutta* in Pali and BSk and an analysis of its contents have shown that this is true to some extent. Generally speaking, parts I and III (*supra*) have been observed to be on a different level from the rest of the poem; and parts IIa and IIb on two separate levels. Doctrinal evidence has shown that the two additional *padas* *Sn*. 231gh are considerably late; and similarly the short stanza *Sn*. 234 which gives a categorical list of attributes of the Buddha appears to be later than the longer stanzas occurring immediately before and after it.

(Continued)



# A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUTTA NIPATA

N. A. Jayawickrama

## THE YAKKHA BALLADS

53

ALTHOUGH the three *Suttas*, *Hemavata*, *Ālavaka* and *Sūciloma* are fundamentally similar in that they are riddle-poems resembling the *Yakṣa Praśnas* of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Hemavata Sutta* demands special attention on account of its extraordinary length and the difference it bears to the other two in details. Unlike the other two *suttas* it contains no prose introduction and its principal characters Sātāgira and Hemavata are represented as friendly beings whereas the two *yakkas* Ālavaka and Suciloma are no more than mere demons.<sup>1</sup> All the three *suttas* are dialogue-ballads, but the dialogue consists of only one question and an answer to it in the *Sūciloma Sutta*, while there are only two characters in the *Ālavaka Sutta*. The dramatic element is quite pronounced in the *Hemavata Sutta*, and the *Ālavaka Sutta* is not devoid of it.

54

### Hemavata Sutta

The *sutta* begins as a conversation between Sātāgira, “the dweller on the Sāta Hill in Majjhimadesa”, and Hemavata, “the Himalayan Sprite”.<sup>2</sup> When the former succeeds in convincing the latter of the virtues of the Buddha, they visit him, and Hemavata who plays the role of the questioner throughout the poem asks the Buddha questions. The two *yakkhas* are delighted with his answers: they extol him and, along with their followers, seek his refuge.

The *sutta* may be divided into three parts, viz: (i) *Sn.* 153-167, the dialogue between the two *yakkhas*, (2) *Sn.* 168-175, the dialogue between Hemavata and the Buddha, (3) *Sn.* 176-180, the conclusion which consists of an exaltation of the Buddha.

Part I. When Sātāgira invites Hemavata to visit Gotama, the latter asks him whether Gotama possesses various qualities, which Sātāgira in his answers affirms. All the virtues of the Buddha which are enumerated in this dialogue may equally well be attributed to any sage. Even the

1. Ālavaka: “of the forest”, from *atavi*, forest; Sūciloma: “needle-haired”.

2. *SnA.* 197. W. Stede suggests that Sātāgira may be a variant for Sātāgila, a secondary form of Satagila “swallowing a hundred”. He further suggests that Nālāgiri stands for Naragila.

few stanzas which are meant to describe the personal attributes (*Sn.* 165-167) lay emphasis on his ascetic life and not his person. In fact the whole poem emphasises the conduct (*cariyā*) and the spiritual attainments of the Buddha (the word used is *citta*—the mind). The Buddha at most here is a perfect *muni* and is not spoken of in the grandiloquent terms that usually accompany a developed phase of Buddhism.

Part II. Hemavata asks a question which may be interpreted as being of cosmological or cosmogonical import, as it vaguely touches upon the *ādi* and *anta* of the universe (*Sn.* 168). The Buddha gives a cryptic answer from a teleological standpoint, but does not enumerate nor specify what groups of six he alludes to (*Sn.* 169). In answer to the next question in which the *yakkha* shows that he has understood the allusions to the *āyatanas* the Buddha mentions the pleasures of the five senses and the mind as *upādāna* (grasping) as the sixth and states that their abandonment leads to emancipation from misery (*Sn.* 171-172). The *yakkha* then asks the nature of the person who crosses the Flood (*ogha*—*Sn.* 173) and the Buddha describes the virtuous sage who has gained spiritual attainments and “does not sink into the deep”. (*Sn.* 174).

Part III. The two *yakkhas* praise the Buddha (*Sn.* 176-177) and compliment themselves for having taken the opportunity of visiting him (*Sn.* 178). They along with their 1,000 followers seek his refuge (*Sn.* 179) and make a solemn pledge to honour the Buddha and the Dhamma (no Saṅgha is mentioned) in all their wanderings (*Sn.* 180). Even here the epithets used of the Buddha are those of the perfect sage.

## 55

The language of the *sutta* is the standard poetical Pali. There are many poetical expressions as *divyā ratti* (*Sn.* 153b), *anomanāmaṃ* (*Sn.* 153c, 177a), *saṃsuddhacāraṇo* (*Sn.* 162b, 163b), *khīnavyappatho* (*Sn.* 158b: Comy, *khīṇo vācāya patho* cp. *Sn.* 1076d: *vādapatha*) and *vyappatha* (*Sn.* 163Ab, 163Bb, 164b, cp. *vyappathayo Sn.* 961a). The frequent use of the interrogative particle *kacci* expressing doubt (18 times) and the disjunctive indeclinable *atho* (7 times) is very striking. Though the indic. 3 sg. *āha* (*Sn.* 158c) is the normal Aor. (pf.) 3 sg. it is used here in the present tense as in several other old *suttas*.

The syntax of the verses is generally straightforward, but there are a few instances of ellipsis; e.g. *Sn.* 168, 169. The Comy. correctly takes *kismiṃ* at *Sn.* 168abd<sup>3</sup> as locative in one or other of its basic meanings

3. *SnA.* 21off. *kismiṃ* at *Sn.* 168a is explained as: *bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇe bhumma-vacanāṃ* (being a condition, it is a locative denoting condition), at 168b: *adhikaraṇatthe bhumma-vacanāṃ* (locative in the sense of relation—in time) and at 168d: *bhāvena bhāvalakkhaṇa-kāraṇatthesu bhumma-vacanāṃ* (being a condition it is a locative characterising condition and denoting cause).



and equates it in the first *pāda* to *kismim uppanne* and in the fourth *pāda* to *kismim sati*. The explanation of *chassu* in the corresponding stanza (Sn. 169) is similar.

As regards style the *sutta* stands out as a highly dramatic piece. Like many other similar ballads this too was probably sung on suitable occasions, three different reciters singing the stanzas ascribed to each of the characters. The poem appears to be divided into two separate scenes, for the dialogue between the two *yakkhas* takes place at one place and their conversation with the Buddha at a different place. Except for a few occasional poetical flashes the style invites no comments. There are two highly descriptive passages in the *sutta*, viz. Sn. 165-167, 176-180. The simile *sīham v'ekacaram* (Sn. 166a) is reminiscent of numerous others of lonely wanderers (vide *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta*). The repetition of the same words at Sn. 163A, 163B and 164 is due to a subsequent expansion probably effected in Burma.<sup>4</sup>

The group of six indicating a set of phenomena need not necessarily be late, and the contents show that the reference is to the *āyatanas*, an early concept in Buddhism. The grouping of epithets at Sn. 167, 176, 177 is to be generally regarded as a sign of lateness, but the absence of any indication of a developed Buddhology attributing supernormal qualities shows that these verses may still be old. There are no indications of these verses being later than the rest of the poem.

**Metre.** The *Anuṣṭubh* ślokas of the poem are interrupted by two stanzas in *Triṣṭubh* (Sn. 176, 177). The repertory phrases (*iti Sātāgiro yakkho*, etc.) which the Comy. attributes to the *saṅgītikārā* (SnA. 193) do not fall within the metre. The break in the metre may perhaps indicate that the two stanzas in *Triṣṭubh* were borrowed from elsewhere; but the full stanza Sn. 176 has not yet been traced to any other work, though three of its individual *pādas* are seen to occur frequently in other metrical works.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand Sn. 177 occurs at S.I. 38 (cp. Sn. 153). Yet, the composite nature of the *Sagāthaka Vagga* of the *Samyutta* does not warrant the inference that Sn. has borrowed this from there. There is no doubt that these stanzas are old. The fact that they are written in the historically older *Triṣṭubh* is further proof of their antiquity. However, it may still be probable that these two stanzas were interpolated from an earlier source. There are also a few metrical irregularities in the poem. Sn. 153 is in mixed *Anuṣṭubh* and *Vaitāliya* (the first *pāda* in *Vaitāliya*). Sn. 154a, 155a, contain nine syllables each instead of eight.

4. Only Burmese Mss. and SnA. accept these two additional stanzas.

5. Sn. 176a: Th. I, 372; S. I, 176b: Vin. I, 36, Sn. 1059b, 1091d; Sn. 176c: D. III, 196, S.I. 4. 50, 51, Dh. 90 cp. Sn. 472c, 501b.

There are "even" *pādas* at *Sn.* 156a, 157a, 158a, 159a, and the *cæsura* is not marked in *Sn.* 176d and 177d.<sup>6</sup>

**Doctrinal Developments.** The whole poem reflects a period when the *Muni*-ideal was the vogue in Buddhism. The emphasis of the poem on the conduct and mental discipline of the Buddha, the reference made to him as the ideal sage, the simple conception of the Buddha as opposed to what may be seen in later works, and the simplicity of the ideas in contrast with the dogmatism of the latter all point to the early date of the poem. The *sutta* is untarnished by any doctrinal colouring of a speculative nature.

In their application none of the terms shows any distinct growth. In *supaṇihita* (*Sn.* 154a, 155a, cp. 163Aa, 163Ba, 164a and the term *padhāna*) is found an idea parallel to *yoga* though the word itself does not occur here. Again, the *yogin* can be implied from *Sn.* 156d, 157d (*jhānam na riñcati*, also cp. terms *satipaṭṭhāna* and *bhāvanā*). These ideas are old and were the common knowledge of all schools of contemporary Indian thought. *Sn.* 154b, 155b, 156b, 157b indirectly convey the idea of *mettā*. The concept of *moha* (*Sn.* 160c, 161c) may be compared with *moha* in the *Bhagavadgītā* (4, 35; 14, 13; 17; 22, etc.). It is essentially a state of mind unlike *māyā* which is more in the nature of a cosmic (or metaphysical) state found in association with the empirical world. The term *dibba patha* has already been commented on.<sup>7</sup> The occurrence of the groups of six at *Sn.* 169 indicates the early classification of the *āyatana*s. They are mentioned later under the *pañca kāmagaṇā* and the mind (*Sn.* 171ab). The didactic element of the *sutta* is best judged from *Sn.* 174-175—two stanzas important from a teleological standpoint. The terms *ogha* and *aṇṇava* have been discussed elsewhere. None of the other terms that occur in this *sutta* calls for particular attention as they are used in all stages of the language.

Judging from internal evidence the *sutta* appears old. Its language shows no signs of lateness while there are no special forms which may be classed as very old. Its diction is the early poetical expression. The numerous *pādas* and stanzas of the second half of the poem (*Sn.* 163A, ff., i.e. at the end of the dialogue between the two *yakkhas*) which are in common with other metrical works<sup>8</sup> suggests that that section of the poem has borrowed freely from an existing floating metrical literature. External evidence will be discussed after dealing with the internal evidence from the other two *suttas*.

6. Helmer Smith, *Metres of the Sutta Nipāta*, *SnA.* II, 3.

7. PBR 1, 3.

8. Vide E. M. Hare, *Woven Cadences*, p. 189 and Otto Franke, *ZDMG*.



### Ālavaka and Sūciloma Suttas

The position of the *Ālavaka Sutta* immediately after the *Hemavata Sutta* points to an attempt at an arrangement of *suttas* according to subject-matter. This has already been noticed in the remarks on the *Vasala Sutta*.<sup>9</sup> However, there is no consistency in this matter, for the *Sūciloma Sutta* is placed in the next (*Culla*) *vagga*, after the *Maṅgala Sutta*. It is also significant that the four *suttas* (beginning with *Farābhava*) preceding *Ālavaka* are *parittas*. Both the *Sūciloma* and *Ālavaka Suttas* contain a prose introduction in which the two *yakkhas* are seen to intimidate the Buddha with identical threats. The Buddha's answer in both instances is the same. The first half of the introduction is somewhat different in the two *suttas*, and there is another *yakkha*, Khara, mentioned in the *Sūciloma Sutta*. In both instances the *sutta* proper begins with a question in verse, after the prelude in prose. The prose of these *suttas* is the canonical idiom, and therefore represents a later phase of Pali than the *gāthās*.<sup>10</sup> The *Yakkha Saṃyutta* (S.I, 206-215) contains both these *suttas* in identical words.<sup>11</sup> It is quite probable that the prose introductions were appended to the *gāthās* during the time of the compilation of *Sn.* as an anthology, and that they were taken from, the legends in the *Yakkha Saṃyutta* though both works are dependent on an earlier tradition for the *gāthās*. In spite of the fact that *Miln.* 36 attributes *Sn.* 184 to *Saṃyutta*, both *Yakkha Saṃyutta* and *Sn.* are collections made from earlier existing material.

The *Ālavaka Sutta*<sup>12</sup> contains a series of questions and answers (*Sn.* 181-190) followed by an epilogue in verse (*Sn.* 191-192) whereas the *Sūciloma Sutta* ends with the Buddha's answer to the question at *Sn.* 190. An examination of the former shows that *Sn.* 190 forms a suitable conclusion to the *sutta* when the line, *so 'ham ajja pajānāmi yo attho samparāyiko* indicates the questioner's complete satisfaction with the answers he has received. The tone of the epilogue appears totally different from that of the rest of the poem, and resembles that of some of the concluding verses of the *Thera-gāthās* or the later *Apadānas*. The only connection of the poem with the *Ālavaka*-legend is in the phrase, *Ālavim āgamā* at *Sn.* 191b. The fact that this *sutta* is perhaps later than the preceding stanzas is also suggested by the statement, *yattha dinnam mahapphalam* (line d) which stands at a much lower level than the previous statement

9. PBR 2, 2, p. 88.

10. *Vide* PBR.

11. *Ālavaka Sutta* at S.I, 213-215; *Sūciloma* at S.I, 207-208.

12. The events connected with the *Ālavaka Sutta* are placed in the sixteenth year after Enlightenment—E. J. Thomas, *Life of the Buddha*, p. 119.

at Sn. 190cd. It appears quite irrelevant that the *yakkha* should realize that the Buddha is an ideal *puññakkhetta*, when he should be thankful for the exposition of his questions. Sn. 192 occurs at Ap. 6, 152; 415, 17 and various commentaries; and its tone appears decidedly late. It is highly probable that Sn. 190 formed the original conclusion of the *gāthās* and that the epilogue was a later addition concurrent with the identification of these *gāthās* with the Ālavaka-legend.

The two opening stanzas of the *Sūciloma Sutta* (Sn. 270-271) consist of a question and an answer. Like the two opening stanzas of the *Ālavaka Sutta* they are *Triṣṭubhs*; the first two stanzas of Hemavata's dialogue with the Buddha are also in *Triṣṭubh* (Sn. 168-169). Questions and answers of this nature are found in a section of the *Devatā Saṃyutta* (S.I, 36-45); and further, two of the above passages occur there: viz: Sn. 168-169 at S.I, 41 and Sn. 181-182 at S.I, 42. The occurrence of these stanzas in the *Saṃyutta*, independently of the rest of the respective poems suggests the existence of a set of riddles dealing with Buddhist topics prior to their being incorporated in longer poems.<sup>13</sup> Unlike the *Ālavaka Sutta*, the *Sūciloma Sutta* seems to have been built upon one such riddle though Sn. 270-271 have not been traced as an independent piece. The third stanza in *Anuṣṭubh* is an explanatory verse on the answer to the riddle. The general appearance of a *sutta* is given by the addition of the concluding stanza. It is obvious that many Pali poems have incorporated earlier existing material, but *Sūciloma Sutta* appears totally different as it is evident that it is built on the framework of the riddle. The four *gāthās* as a whole, appear old, but on the basis of this argument Sn. 270-271 are older than the other two.

## 57

The language of the *suttas* is considerably old; and the *Ālavaka Sutta* preserves many dialectical as well as old historical forms. The phrase *mittāni ganthati* (Sn. 185d, 187d) preserves the historical gender of *mitta*, although in Pali the word is masculine. The idiom itself is perhaps Vedic or post-Vedic rather than Classical Sanskrit or Pali. The word *sussūsā* is to be taken as a shorter inst. sg. (Vedic) and not as a contraction of the Pali *sussūsāya*. There is a Vedic ppr. in *saddahāno* (cp. *śrad-dadhāna*—Sn. 186a); there are dialectical forms as *iṅgha* and *bhiyyo* (Sn. 189—also in prose). The particle of interrogation *su* is frequently added to the interrogative pronouns to emphasise the question, as is characteristic of

13. The tradition preserved in the *Devatā Saṃyutta* may perhaps be synchronous with a floating riddle literature which was the predecessor of Sanskrit riddle poetry. Also vide Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, I 352 on old riddle poetry.



old *gāthā*-Pali (cp. Epic *sma*). Other old forms are: agent noun *uṭṭhātā* (Sn. 187b) and imp. 2 sg. *Ātp. pucchassu* (Sn. 189a). There are hardly any peculiar forms in the *Sūciloma Sutta*. The forms *kutonidānā*, *kutojā* (Sn. 270), *itonidānā*, *itojā* (Sn. 271) are common poetical forms. The reading *ḍhaṃkaṃ* (crow) should be preferred to *vaṅkaṃ* (see also SnA. 303).

**Style.** Both *suttas* are dialogue-ballads, but the dialogue is more pronounced in the *Ālavaka Sutta*. The moral truths are stated expressively in a series of questions and answers in clear and simple language (cp. the opening stanzas of *Bhg.* VIII). The *sutta* lends itself to easy dramatization on account of its being well punctuated by the words of the two interlocutors. The concluding stanza (Sn. 192) like Sn. 179-180, enhances its dramatic effect. The *Sūciloma Sutta*, though short, is more ornate than the other. It contains three similes viz. Sn. 270d-271d, 272b, 272d; and the stanza Sn. 271 is rather cryptic.

**Metre:** The break in metre in the two poems has already been noted (*supra*). Although *Triṣṭubh* is historically older than *Anuṣṭubh* śloka, it in itself provides no useful data. As observed earlier, the occurrence of one of these *Triṣṭubh* passages (Sn. 181-182) at S.I, 42 and a similar passage (Sn. 168-169, though in *Anuṣṭubh* śloka) at S.I, 41 along with many other similar questions and answers, in the *Devatā Saṃyutta*, may presuppose the early existence of a traditional riddle-literature independent of longer *suttas*. The disparity in metre is therefore due to the fact that some of these passages are either incorporated in, or utilised to build up (as in the case of the *Sūciloma Sutta*) longer poems. The two opening stanzas of both *suttas*, thus appear to have belonged to an altogether different stratum from the rest of the two poems. Metrical irregularities are almost absent in the *Anuṣṭubh* ślokas (Sn. 184-192, 271). There are two instances of *even* quarters at Sn. 186a and 187a. Of the *Triṣṭubh* stanzas (Sn. 181-182, 270-271, 273) Sn. 270b-271b are irregular. Besides containing anacrusis, the caesura after the seventh syllable is not reckoned in them.<sup>14</sup> There are two instances of metrical lengthening, viz. *āvahāti* (Sn. 181b-182b) and *larati* (Sn. 183a-184a). The lengthening in *sū'dha* (Sn. 182a) is due to *sandhi*.

**Doctrinal Evidence:** Notwithstanding a few words with a semi—or quasi-technical significance, such as *ogha*, *aṇṇava*, *appamāda*, *virīya* and *paññā* (*Ālavaka*), *rāga* and *dosa* (*Sūciloma*), the two *suttas* are marked by a total lack of metaphysical thought. The simplicity of ideas and the emphasis laid on *saddhā* shed some light on the antiquity of the *Ālavaka Sutta*. The popular character of the whole poem is also seen

14. Helmer Smith, *ibid.*

from the occurrence of the word *idha* (here, on earth) in *saddh'īdha* (Sn. 182a). The popular teachings embodied in the *sutta* (in Sn. 188-189 which state the four fundamental qualities *sacca*, *dhamma*—or *dama*, *dhiti*—or *khanti*, and *cāga*, requisite of a devout householder) are reminiscent of the *Dharmaśāstras* and other allied branches of Sanskrit literature. The practice of one's *dharma*, truthfulness, discriminate living, diligence, energy, wisdom, desire to learn, doing what is correct, tenacity and perseverance all contribute to help a person to reap the benefits of learning, fame, wealth, acquisition of friends, etc. These teachings were accepted by all schools alike as Sn. 189 points out. The answer to the important question of teleological significance (Sn. 183) emphasises the role *saddhā* plays in popular Buddhism. As the contents show, this *sutta* dealing with popular teachings appears old and seems to have drawn freely from the fund of old Indian knowledge. The *Sūciloma Sutta* which deals with detachment from passions is particularly more Buddhistic than the other. Though the *sutta* itself is too brief to draw any inference on doctrinal grounds, it has the general appearance of an old piece (specially Sn. 270-271). The poem as a whole may not be of very great antiquity, but the two opening verses, for reasons discussed above, are at least as old as the *Hemavata* and *Ālavaka Suttas*.

## 58

### The Yakkha-legend (Ālavaka)

The following observations on the *yakkha*-legend shed some light on our *suttas*. The Commentary connects the story of Ālavaka with that of Sātāgira and Hemavata (SnA. 221ff.). When the two *yakkhas* Sātāgira and Hemavata were on their way to Jetavana in order to pay their respects to be Buddha before proceeding to the assembly of the *yakkhas*, they found it impossible to pass over Ālavaka's abode. On investigating the cause they found the Buddha there, saluted him, listened to the *dhamma* and continued their flight to their final destination. A similar story is found at UdA. 64 when they passed the abode of Ajapālaka-*yakkha*. In this story is seen a popular attempt, however late it may be, to link up the various *yakkhas* with one another. The legend of Ālavaka occurs in similar words at SA. 317ff. in the commentary on the *sutta* in the *Yakkha Saṃyutta*. A summary of the same legend occurs at AA. 389ff. in the comments on Hatthaka Ālavaka, a prince who is said to have been saved from the *yakkha*'s hands.<sup>15</sup> The story itself has much in common with the circle of legends grouped by Watanabe<sup>16</sup> under the

15. In the list of *etad-aggas* at A.I, 26 he is called the most pre-eminent of those who cherish the assembly with the four *saṅgha vatthu* (bases of generosity).

16. JPTS., 1909-1910, pp.240ff.



title *Kalmāṣapāda Stories*. The essential links are: (1) the man eating *yakkha*, (2) the captured king who obtains his freedom by promising to provide the *yakkha* with food, and the sanctity of that promise, and (3) the conversion of the *yakkha*. This similarity to the *Kalmāṣapāda* group is sufficient proof of the antiquity of the *Ālavaka*-legend.<sup>17</sup>

## 59

## External Evidence

There are sufficient references in the Canon to most of the *yakkhas* who are represented as taking part in these dialogues. Hemavata and Sātāgira are included in the list of great *yakkhas* whose protection should be sought when troubled by other *yakkhas*.<sup>18</sup> Their names represent a class of *yakkhas* (probably their followers) in the *Mahāsamaya Sutta*. *Cha sahaṣṣā Hemavatā yakkhā* . . . and *Sātāgirāti sahaṣṣā yakkhā* (D. II, 256) may be contrasted with *Ime dasasatā yakkhā* at Sn. 179 which speaks of a following of 1,000 instead of a total of 7,000.

The occurrence of the *Ālavaka and Sūciloma Suttas* in identical words, in the *Yakkha Saṃyutta* has already been mentioned. Besides this the statue of Sūciloma which is found at the Bharhut Stūpa along with those of many other *yakkhas* is a fair land-mark indicating the early acquaintance with all these *yakkhas*.<sup>19</sup> There is no doubt whatsoever that all these *yakkhas* were known, as seen from the references in the Pali Canon, long before the time of Bharhut, yet the Stūpa itself is helpful in determining the lower limit of the date of these legends.

No remarks need be made here on the concept *yakkha*, the part *yakkhas* play in Indian literature or the origin of the *yakkha*-cult. These questions have been exhaustively dealt with by scholars like A. K. Coomaraswamy (*Yakṣas*), W. Stede (*Gesperster geschichten des Peta Vatthu*; and s.v. P.T.S.), Dela Vallée Poussin (*Indo-Européens et Indo-Iraniens; L'Inde jusque vers 300 av. J.C.*), O. H. de A. Wijesekera (U.C.R. I, 2) etc. It is also of no importance to investigate further the Commentarial accounts linking up the legends of various *yakkhas*. The question to be solved is how these *yakkhas* came to be associated with the *gāthās* in Sn. As hinted at earlier, the *suttas* may be analysed roughly into four different strata: (1) riddles which perhaps preceded the rest of the *suttas* (Sn.

17. Malalasekera, D.P.P.N. (s.v.).

18. D. III, 204-205; *Ātānāṭiya Sutta*. Cp. the statement at SnA. 197, *Hemavata-Sātāgirā atthavīsati yakkha-senāpatinaṃ abbhantarā mahānubhāvā yakkharājāno ahesuṃ*.

19. Cunningham, The Stūpa of Bharhut. He assigns the date of the Stūpa as 250-200 B.C. (p. 14): The inscription under Sūciloma is *Sūciloma-yakho* (p. 136 and plate XXII). Also vide Coomaraswamy, *Yakṣas*, I. p.5.

168-169, 181-182, 270-271), (2) the poems incorporating the riddles (*Sn.* 153-167, 168-178, 181-190), (3) The concluding stanzas of the *suttas* (*Sn.* 179-180, 191-192), or the comment in verse *Sn.* 272 and the conclusion *Sn.* 273 and (4) the prose.

The fact that no reference whatsoever is made to *yakkhas* in parts 1 and 2 (except in the repertory phrases which the Commentator attributes to the *saṅgītikārā*—*SnA.* 193) may probably indicate that these poems were at one stage quite independent of *yakkhas*. Internal evidence has shown that the concluding stanzas bear signs of lateness. The identification of these *suttas* with the various *yakkhas* is simultaneous with the inclusion of these stanzas in the poems. The number of followers of Hemavata and Sātāgira mentioned at *Sn.* 179 being less than that in the *Mahāsamaya Sutta* one is prevented from assigning a very late date to the concluding stanzas, for presumably the number mentioned in the latter points to a more developed legend. The introductions in typical canonical prose are definitely of a much later stratum than the *gāthās*. From the evidence at hand it is not possible to determine specifically when these successive additions were made. The internal evidence is very convincing that the *gāthās* in parts 1 and 2 belong to an older stage than the rest of the respective *suttas*. It is quite probable that the prose (like many other prose passages in *Sn.*) was taken from outside (in this case the *Samyutta*) at the time of the final collation of *Sutta Nipāta* as an anthology.

## THE PASTORAL BALLADS

### 60

#### Dhaniya Sutta

THE *Dhaniya Sutta* consists chiefly of a dialogue between the rich herdsman Dhaniya and the Buddha. A third interlocutor (Māra) appears towards the end of the *sutta*, and the narrator himself interrupts the dialogue by describing the scene at *Sn.* 30.<sup>20</sup> The recitation of the ballads may have proceeded on a line quite similar to the dialogue in the (later) medieval European Miracle Play. The dramatic element predominates in the *sutta* and the possibility of different reciters singing the respective stanzas attributed to the various characters has been suggested earlier.<sup>21</sup> It may be said that more definite signs of dramatic representation are seen in the sudden appearance of Māra voicing the popular opinion (*Sn.* 33, 34). At the same time doubts may be cast on the genuineness

20. *Vide SnA.* 42.

21. PBR 1, 2, p. 90.



of these two stanzas; for, firstly *Sn.* 32 appears to be a suitable conclusion to the poem when the herdsman and his wife pledge to practise the holy life; secondly, the recurrence of these two stanzas in totally different contexts at *S.I.*, 6 and 107-108<sup>22</sup> suggests that they belonged to a stock of traditional twin-verses, best represented by the *Sagāthaka Vagga* of the *Samyutta* and the *Yamaka Vagga* of the *Dhammapada*; and finally, the greater metrical perfection indicating them as distinct from the rest of the stanzas may also point to a difference in the date of composition. Although this is no conclusive proof, it may be surmised with some degree of accuracy that these two stanzas were a subsequent interpolation.

The *sutta* is mainly a poetical duel between the two chief interlocutors, "the one rejoicing in his worldly security and the other in his religious belief".<sup>23</sup> In the alternating stanzas which are highly artistic the Buddha invariably uses the very words of the herdsman either to express the exact opposite or to give a new value to them. Sometimes even the same sounds are reproduced with identical metrical value but expressing something totally different, e.g. *Sn.* 18a, 19a *pakkoduno duddhakhīro: akkodhano vigatakhīlo*. The opposite ideas are expressed in *Sn.* 18c, 19c with a different connotation for the words repeated viz. *channā kuṭi āhito gini : vivaṭā kuṭi nibbuto gini*.<sup>24</sup> Sometimes the words in the corresponding stanzas differ considerably, though in each case the speaker makes a statement to illustrate his point of view, e.g. *Sn.* 20, 21. The contrast is shown only in the topics discussed in *Sn.* 22, 23, i.e. *gopī* and *cittam* respectively. The Buddha is seen playing on the word *bhata* when Dhaniya says that he is self-supporting (*Sn.* 24, 25). The next stanza of the *Bhagavā* is a mere negation of the herdsman's statement. When Dhaniya speaks of tethering his animals the Buddha declares that he has broken all bonds (*bandhanāni*) and will not seek birth again. Another pair of alternating stanzas concludes the poem when Buddha categorically denies the tempting words of Māra (*Sn.* 33, 34).

### Language and Syntax

Proceeding on to an examination of the internal evidence, language calls for attention first. The *sutta* contains many archaic and poetical forms.

22. In the former instance the stanza is attributed to a *devatā*, and in the latter to Māra.

23. Fausböll: *Translation of the Sutta Nipāta*, SBE. Vol. X. p. 3.

24. The Commentary (*Sn.A.* 31) says that *kuṭi* refers to the body; *kuṭi'ti attabhāvo. kāyo ti pi, guhā ti pi* (*Sn.* 772), *deho ti pi, sandeho ti pi* (*Th.* 1. 20 Dh. 148) *nāvā ti pi* (*Dh.* 369), *ratho ti pi* (*S.* IV. 292), *dhajo ti pi, vammiko ti pi* (*M.I.* 144), *kuti ti pi, kuikā ti pi* (*Th.* 1, etc.) *vuccati*.

There occur several special poetical compounds as *pakkodano*, *duddhakhīro* (Sn. 18a,) *akkodhano*, *vigatakhīlo* (Sn. 19a), and *samānavāso* (Sn. 18b, cp. *samāniyā*, Sn. 24b). The lengthening in *patthayasī* in the refrain is partly archaic and partly metrical. Besides this there are other archaic verbal forms such as *vijjare* (Sn. 20a, cp. *haññare*, *bhāsare*, etc. and Vedic *śere* and *īśire* > Pkr. *-ire* > P. *-are*, vide Geiger, 122.2); *sakkhinti* (Sn. 28c) historical future from  $\sqrt{\text{śak}}$ , *śak-ṣya-* > \**sakkhya-* > *sakghi-* with *samprasāraṇa*; and other historical forms as *upessaṃ* (future, Sn. 29c), *pāvassi* (Aor., Sn. 30b), *abhāsatha* (Sn. 30d), *addasāma* (Sn. 31b), *carāmase* (Sn. 32b) and *bhavāmase* (Sn. 32d) which call for no particular attention. An interesting nominal form is *gini* (Sn. 18c, 19c) which is dialectical as well as archaic and perhaps poetic. This form probably comes from a dialectical stratum. The initial vowel has dropped off due to loss of accent. (Vedic *agni* > P. *aggi*/ *aggini*/ *gini*, cp. *ātmā* > *attā*/ *ātumā*/ *tumā*).<sup>25</sup> Other noteworthy forms are: *samvāsiyā* at Sn. 22b, (diaeretic, cp. *samāniyā*, Sn. 24b), *nibbiṭṭhena* at Sn. 25b (adverbial inst.) and the sandhi *usabho-r-iva* with the introduction of the pseudo-organic-r; Skr, *vr̥ṣabha-iva* > P. *usabho-iva*, the deleted *visarga* is restored to bridge the hiatus. The word *deva*, in the refrain is used in the popular sense of cloud and the p.p. *nibbuto* (Sn. 19c) in its original meaning.

The *syntax* of the poem also shows that its language belongs to an early stratum of Pali. The free use of the genitive with the verb *suṇāti* (e.g. *tassā na suṇami k' iñci pāpaṃ*—I hear no evil of her—Sn. 22c, cp. Sn. 24c, and *sutva devassa vassato*—hearing it rain—Sn. 30c) is an early construction. The predication of a plural subject with *atthi* is a poetic usage (Sn. 26, 27).<sup>26</sup> The syntax of *brahmacariyaṃ Sugate carāmase*. (Let us practise the holy life under the Sugata—Sn. 32b) also strikes as belonging to old Pali. The nominal prefix *anu-* in *anutīre* (Sn. 18b, 19b) and the phrase, *tiṇṇo pāragato* expressing the early Buddhist concept of ‘crossing over to the Beyond’ are old.

### Style

A few remarks on the style of the *sutta* have already been made in the introduction. The poem stands out as a product of great literary skill and high poetic genius on the part of the composer. With a skilful use of words effecting as little change as possible in the alternating stanzas the author has been successful in illustrating the different points of view of the two interlocutors. The choice of words and expressions is very apt and lends a majestic air to the whole poem. The ballad is no mere versification unlike the artificial poetry of the late Ceylon Chronicles.

25. *Tumā* < Vedic *tman* a by-form of *ātmān*.

26. It is a petrified form even in canonical prose.



All the stanzas are very descriptive and the words of the herdsman paint a beautiful picture of a pastoral scene. Of equal merit is the stanza attributed to the narrator (*Sn.* 30). The refrain (occurring in *Sn.* 18-29) with the word *deva* for rain-cloud is very effective.

Simile, metaphor, world-play, alliteration and assonance and onomatopoeia are employed to some degree. Both the similes used at *Sn.* 29 reflect ideas quite familiar to other parts of the Canon (cp. *Th*1, 1184, *Th*2, 301. *Ap.* 60, 10 etc.). Most of the Buddha's answers to Dhaniya contain metaphors. E. M. Hare (*Woven Cadences*, pp. 218ff.) has pointed out word-play at *Sn.* 18a = 19a, 18b = 19b, 22a = 23a, and alliteration and assonance at *Sn.* 21a, 25abc, 28a, 29b and 33ab=34ab. An onomatopoeic effect is produced by phrases such as, *sutvā devassa vassato* (*Sn.* 30c), etc. In spite of the poetical devices employed there appear no signs of lateness in the language of the poem and there is much positive evidence to show that the poem is old.

### Metre

The metre of the poem is not uniform, but it is evident that it follows the pattern of the *Vaitāliya* and *Aupacchandāsika*—both metres of popular origin in which the syllabic instants are taken into account. Something definite can be said of only the two concluding stanzas which are in *Vaitāliya* (14, 16; 14, 16). Of the remaining stanzas the sum-total of *morae* in a half-stanza ranges from 29 (*Sn.* 30cd) to 37 (*Sn.* 28ab). Some of the pairs of stanzas in the main dialogue agree metrically; viz. *Sn.* 18, 19 contain 36, 30 *morae* each in their half stanzas, *Sn.* 20, 21; 32, 32 and 32, 31 *morae* respectively. *Sn.* 26, 27; 31, 32 *morae* in each: while there is a disparity in varying degrees in the others viz. *Sn.* 22, 23 in *pāda* c, only (16, 19, 16, 17; 16, 19, 13, 17 respectively); *Sn.* 24, 25 in *pādas* ac. (14, 18, 16, 17; 13, 18, 13, 17 respectively), and *Sn.* 28, 29 in all *pādas* except the refrain (17, 20, 17, 17; 15, 17, 18, 17 respectively).

In addition to *Sn.* 33 and 34, *Sn.* 32 can also be taken as a *Vaitāliya* stanza with anacrusis in the *pāda* b, as pointed out by Helmer Smith<sup>27</sup>. *Sn.* 20 consists of the number of syllabic instants required for the *Aupacchandāsika* metre and the rest of the stanzas contain either more or less *morae* than required for that metre. Other metrical irregularities already observed by scholars<sup>28</sup> are: anacrusis at *Sn.* 22b = 23b, 30b, trochaic *pāda* at *Sn.* 24a; and 26b = 27b containing a *mora* too short (*godharaṇīyo*) for the *Aupacchandāsika* metre. (Helmer Smith, *ibid*). The lack of uniformity in the metre of the poem supports the view that the writers

27. *SnA.* 643.

28. *Ibid*.

of these ballads have been mainly guided by rhythm *and not fixed metres*. Perhaps these stanzas mark the transition from the purely popular versification to the more fixed *Vaitāliya* and *Aupacchandasik* metres. This too is in agreement with the general antiquity of the poem.

### Doctrinal Developments

No real developments in doctrine are in evidence in the *sutta*. The ideology of the poem conforms to that of Buddhism in its earliest phase. The various Buddhist concepts alluded to in the Buddha's replies to Dhaniya belong to early Buddhism, and therefore demand no particular attention. The only term with a technical significance is *upadhi* (substratum of rebirth—*Sn.* 33, 34) which is known from early Buddhist times, and is met with no less than 19 times in *Sn.* On doctrinal evidence the *sutta* appears to be considerably old.

### 62

### External Evidence

An interesting feature of the poem is that very few of its *pādas* in the main dialogue are to be met with in other metrical works, though the refrain occurs at *Thl.* 51-54, 325. On the other hand, the ideas in the *sutta* are common to other parts of the Canon as well. The various metaphorical allusions (e.g. to *kuṭi*, *gini*, *bhisi*, etc.) in the Buddha's replies, can be compared with the numerous similes and parables in other parts of the Canon<sup>29</sup>; e.g. the simile of the *kuṭi* at *M.I.*, 190, *Thl.* 125 etc., *bhisi* cp. the parable of the raft (*kulla*) *M.I.*, 134, etc. The whole of the sixth *vagga* of the *Eka-nipāta* of *Thl.* (*Thl.* 51-60) is connected with *kuṭi*. The occurrence of *Sn.* 33, 34 at *S.I.* has already been discussed. The fact that the majority of the *pādas* in the main dialogue are not found repeated in other metrical works may suggest that these stanzas were quite distinct from the rest. Yet in contents they agree. Taking all the internal evidence (specially from language, syntax and metre) into account it may be said that these stanzas may have been anterior to the bulk of the Pāli metrical works.

### 63

### Kasibhāradvāja Sutta

The other "Pastoral Ballad" *Kasibhāradvāja Sutta* is a regular *ākkyāna* containing narrative prose connecting the *gāthās*. The poem itself is a modified parable in which the Buddha explains the Dhamma to the

29. The Commentator gives an exhaustive list of similar occurrences (*SnA.* 31-11) which Helmer Smith has traced in the foot-notes.



ploughman by employing the terminology used by him. Though the *gāthās* consist of only a question and an answer to it, they fit into the general scheme of the narrative which is conducted entirely in prose. The prose which is both introductory and explanatory appears to have been used in order to acquaint the reader (or the listener) with the context of the verses, of which *Sn.* 76-80 form a separate unit (i.e. the Buddha as ploughman). Like all prose introductions to ballads, it is quite probable that at some early stage the prose of this *sutta* was not fixed, and that the singers of the ballads described the situation in their own words. The fact that the version of this *sutta* found at S.I., 172-173 (*Brāhmaṇa-Samyutta*) contains these *gāthās verbatim*, but shows a divergence in the prose<sup>30</sup> is in agreement with the unsettled nature of the prose. Further, the enhanced version of the conclusion in *Sn.* may be indicative of the relative lateness of the compilation of *Sn.* (as an anthology), for decidedly the shorter version in the *Samyutta* is the older of the two. The possibility of the existence of two recensions within the same Theravāda School is very remote, and it is quite clear that both versions are based on the same tradition and that the *sutta* in *Sn.* is merely an enlargement of the same occurring in the *Samyutta*.

The formula-like phrases of the introduction and conclusion which agree word for word with all such passages in *suttas* dealing with conversions made by the Buddha, and the emphasis laid on the miracle as an ingredient to conversion exemplifying the consequence of the *iddhi*-power of the Buddha (*Sn.* p. 15) rather than the teaching itself, are positive indications of the lateness of the prose of the *sutta* as contrasted with the *gāthās*. There occur a few irregular verbal forms in the prose, which are of no great value here, as they are used in all periods of canonical Pāli; viz. *dammi*, an old form used in all periods (*vide* Geiger §143) cp. Epic Sk. *dadmi*; *dakkhinti*, future, cp. *sakkhinti* (*vide* Geiger §152), but has the appearance of an old (Vedic) injunctive<sup>31</sup>; and *alattha* S-Aor.—all occurring in *Sn.* pp. 15-16. One is also struck by the frequent occurrence of imper. 2 sg. forms in -*ssu* (historical) and the wealth of denominatives in the passage describing the miracle.

The stanzas in the *sutta* are not very remarkable, and fail to reach the perfection of those of the companion poem, *Dhaniya Sutta*. Syntactically there appears nothing worthy of comment as the verses merely compare in a series of simple sentences, the counterparts in the religious life

30. Both introduction are identical. The prose passage after the fifth stanza (*Sn.* 80) runs: *Bhuñjatu bhavaṃ Gotamo, kassako bhavaṃ Gotamo, yaṃ hi Gotamo amātapphalaṃ pi kaṣiṃ kaṣatī ti.* The concluding passage in S. begins with, *Evaṃ vutte Kasibhāradvāja brāhmaṇo bhagavantam etad-avoca: Abhikkantaṃ bho Gotama,* etc. (*Sn.* p. 15, 11. 17 to I, 1. p. 16) and concludes: *upāsakaṃ maṃ bhavaṃ Gotamo dhāretu ajja-t-agge pāṇupetaṃ saraṇaṃ gatan ti.*

31. *Vide.* Pischel §§525-6, 529, 532.

to the various implements and actions in ploughing. On the one hand, the absence of exact counterparts for some items in the similes (e. g. Sn. 78ab), and on the other, the mention of two for the same object (e.g. Sn. 77bd, *paññā* and *sati*) speak further of the lack of perfection of the poem.

The *language* of the verses is essentially *gāthā*-Pali. Yet, archaisms are few. The only noteworthy forms are:—*jānemu* (Sn. 76d) cp. Pkr. *jānimo* and *jānāmo*, Sk. -*maḥ* > Pkr. -*mo* > P. -*mu* (vide Pischel §510); and *dhuradhorayha* (Sn. 79a), a peculiar double nominal form (*dhura*+*dhora*-*vahya* s.v. P.T.S.). The sandhi in *vuttir esā* (Sn. 81d) is historical.

The *metre* of the poem is somewhat regular; Sn. 76-80 are *Anuṣṭubh* slokas and Sn. 81-82 are *Triṣṭubh*. There is anacrusis at Sn. 79a and the caesura is not reckoned after the seventh syllable at Sn. 82d. Metrical lengthening is to be seen at Sn. 77c (*hirī*) and 81d (*salī*) in addition to instances like *puññapekha*; (Sn. 82d) for rhythm rather than metre. The style of the *sutta* has been sufficiently commented on earlier.

The *ideology* of the poem does not show any late developments. The emphasis is on the practical aspect and the attainment of deliverance through moral and intellectual discipline. Qualities like *saddhā*, *tapo*, *paññā*, *hiri*, *sati*, *sacca*, *soracca*, *virīya* and the control over mind, body and speech are accepted as virtues by all early Indian schools; yet the training envisaged in the *sutta* is essentially Buddhistic. There is neither speculation nor metaphysics, and the teaching, however tersely expressed, does not show any departure from what may be expected in the earliest teaching.

There are two terms which demand further attention; viz. *yogakkhema* (Sn. 79b) and *kevalin* (Sn. 82a). The technical significance of the former has come about by a direct semantic development from Vedic. In Vedic it meant “exertion and rest, acquisition and possession” (s.v. PTS), whereas in Classical Sk., “security, secure possession of what has been acquired, or insurance “as at *Manu*. IX, 219. According to the Petersburg Sk. Dictionary, it is usually explained as “gain and support of a possession” and at *Gaut*. 28, 46 it means “property destined for religious purposes”. But all these ideas are remote from the Pali meanings. The non-technical meaning of “rest from work” in Pali, is nearer Vedic, and the idea of “freedom from bondage” is logically connected with the former. The term *kevalin*, which occurs as many as 7 times in Sn. is an epithet for the “perfect one”. The idea itself is very familiar to the Canon even in such phrases as *kevalaparipunnāṃ*, etc., though the concept is seen best developed in Jainism (cp. *kevalin*, the perfect one,



an epithet for *tīrthaṅkara*, and *kaivalya*, epithet for *nirvāṇa*). The origin and conception of the idea is definitely pre-Buddhistic, but it need not be through any Jaina influence that its adoption has taken place in Buddhism.

The evidence from all these sources taken singly does not yield any definite data as regards the date of the poem, but taking the collective evidence the stanzas have a claim to comparative antiquity.

## 64

## External Evidence

It has already been observed above that the *sutta* is an enlarged version of that found at S.I., 172. The additional prose passage found on p. 15 is seen to occur in the *Sundarika Sutta* at S.I., 167-168 though the *Sundarikabhāradvāja Sutta* in Sn. (III, 4) contains no corresponding passage. In order to establish the relationship of these two *suttas*, their common factor Sn. 81-82 = Sn. 480-481, has to be taken into account. These two stanzas are repeated in three *suttas* in the *Brāhmaṇa Saṃyutta*; viz. at S.I., 167 (*Aggika*-), I, 168 (*Sundarika*-), and I, 173 (*Kasi*-). This necessitates a comparison of these three *suttas* with the corresponding ones in Sn.<sup>32</sup>

In all the instances where the two stanzas Sn. 81-82 occur there is apparently sufficient justification for their inclusion, for the introductions state either that the Buddha was on his alms-round or that the brahmin was preparing an oblation. However, the stories contained in these three *suttas* show that at some stage or another there has set in a confusion of legend. Although it is not easy to say which *sutta* portrays the original version of the story, the influence of one on the other two is evident. It is significant that the section ending with Sn. 80, has very

32. *Aggika Sutta* (S.I., 166-167) corresponds to, *Vasala Sutta* (pp. 142-151) which in Sn. bears the alternative title *Aggikabhāradvāja Sutta*. The only noteworthy similarity of the two *suttas* lies in their respective introductions, though they differ widely in details. The *nidāna* (scene of the *sutta*) in Sn. is *Sāvatthi* whereas it is *Rājagaha* in S. In both *suttas* the Brahmin is said to be preparing for a fire-sacrifice though it is stated in different words (Sn. p. 21, *aggipajjalito hoti, āhuti paggaḥita*; S.I., 166, *sappinā pāyāso sannihito hoti, 'aggim juhissāmi, agghuttam paricarissāmi'*ti). In Sn. the Brahmin abuses the Buddha whereas in S. he offers the *pāyāsa* (in verse) which the Buddha refuses with the stanzas *Gāthābhigītā*, etc. The stanzas in the two poems are entirely different though the phrase, *na jaccā hoti brāhmaṇo* (S.I., 166<sup>32</sup>, Sn. 136b, 142b) is common to both. The concluding prose is the same.

The introductions to both versions of the *sutta* recording the conversation between the Buddha and *Sundarikabhāradvāja* are almost identical but only 5 of the 10 stanzas in S. have parallels in the 32 stanzas in Sn.; viz.; S. v. 1 = Sn. 462, (v. 8), S. v. 2 // Sn. 463 (v. 2ab = Sn. 463ab), S. v. 3 // Sn. 459, 479 (v. 3bc = Sn. 459bc), S. v. 4-5 = Sn. 480. 481. The miraculous incident (// Sn. p. 15) is related at S.I., 168-169, following which occurs a set of 5 stanzas, both of which being absent in Sn. The conclusion is identical in both works. (Sufficient has been said of the *Kasibhāradvāja Sutta*, earlier).

little connection with the rest of the *sutta*, in the *Kasibhāradvāja Sutta*. The discourse ends there, and the line,

*etaṃ kaṣiṃ kaṣitvāna, sabbadukkhā pamunccati,*

affords a fitting climax. Unlike the *Sundarikabhāradvāja Sutta* (both in S. and Sn.) the story is not centred on ‘what is left of the sacrificial cake’ (*havyasesa*), which has a greater mysterious significance than *pāyāsa* (*Kasi*-), a thing mentioned only at this secondary stage. The difference in metre of Sn. 81-82 from that in the previous stanzas, and the uniformity in this respect, of all the stanzas (including these two) of the *Samyutta* version of the *Sundarika Sutta* (and to some extent the poem in Sn.) tend to emphasise the fact that Sn. 81-82 *did not originally belong here*.<sup>33</sup>

In view of all this evidence, both internal and external, it may be concluded that (a), the *sutta* consists of two different elements (i) Sn. 76-80 with the prose introduction which at some stage was not in any fixed form, (ii) the two stanzas Sn. 81-82 and the prose on pp. 15-16 which constitute a subsequent addition, (b), the *sutta* has been greatly influenced by another *sutta* (probably the *Sundarika Sutta* of S.), the main theme of which was the exemplification of the miraculous powers of the Buddha, (c), the *sutta* in its present form has been included in Sn. at a date much later than that of the composition of the stanzas, and (d), the *sutta* probably is later than the *Brāhmaṇa Samyutta*, if it has been influenced by the *Sundarika Sutta*.

---

33. The *Sundarika Sutta* (S.) presents a more coherent narrative of the incident while the parallel version in Sn. is *either* an amalgamation of two suttas, one of which was based on the first 5 stanzas of the *sutta* in S. *or* an altogether different *sutta* which has incorporated a greater part of the legend i.e. without the miracle, as well the first five stanzas.



# A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUTTA NIPATA

N. A. Jayawickrama

## THE NARRATIVE BALLADS

The *Pabbajjā* and *Padhāna Suttas* and the *Vatthu-gāthā* of *Nālaka Sutta* and *Pārāyana Vagga* and part of the epilogue to the latter can be classed as narrative pieces in *Sn.* In addition to these there are other isolated narrative verses (*Sn.* 30, 251-252, etc.), which the Commentator himself attributes to the *saṅgītikārā*. Out of these narrative pieces, the *Vatthu-gāthā* of the *Pārāyana* have been fully discussed in the general remarks on that *vagga*. An attempt will now be made at a more detailed examination of the *Pabbajjā*, *Padhāna* and *Nālaka Suttas*. A brief reference has already been made to them, and Winternitz's significant statement that they form the earliest beginnings of a life of Buddha in verse, has been noted. A little more has been said about these *suttas* in the general discussion on the *Mahāvagga*, and the arrangement of the *suttas* in it.

65

### Pabbajjā Sutta

The *Pabbajjā Sutta*<sup>1</sup> is essentially a narrative ballad, which on account of the highly interesting dialogue it contains can be called a dialogue-ballad at the same time. The whole *sutta* is built upon the event of Bimbisāra's first meeting with the Buddha. The first three stanzas serve as an introduction to the narrative, which proceeds throughout in the 3rd person, and the other 17 (*Sn.* 408-424) constitute the body of the ballad. It will be noticed (later) that these introductory verses did not form an integral part of the poem. The dialogue-stanzas of the *sutta* are of a highly dramatic character. The narrative-stanzas interspersed with the dialogue, describe in successive stages the events leading up to the point when the respective characters represented in the *sutta* make their statements. It is not improbable that this poem was a regular dramatic ballad, in which the narrator recited the narrative stanzas while others sang the respective stanzas assigned to the various characters; for, in many respects the narrative verses closely resemble the prose narrative element in the regular "Ākhyāna-ballads" of *Sn.* (e.g. *Kasibhāradvāja Sutta*); and the dialogue stanzas, the dialogue element in such *suttas*. The description of the change of scene and events enables the listener to follow the dialogue closely.

---

1. The Commentary (*SnA.* 381) ascribes the *sutta* to Ananda.

From the analogy of the “*Ākhyāna*-type” of mixed ballads it may be argued that only the dialogue (Sn. 410-411, 416, 420-424) formed the original ballad and that the narrative stanzas were merely a versification of earlier extant prose, which was perhaps like the narrative prose of some of the *suttas* in Sn. However, this cannot be established with any degree of certainty. Neither can it be said whether the poetical forms in the narrative stanzas are artificial forms based on the prose or not. Yet, in two instances (Sn. 406, 417-419) the narrative verses closely resemble the standard form of expression in prose canonical Pāli.<sup>2</sup> This coincidence is not a mere accident.

As regards the forms themselves in these narrative-stanzas they present no divergence from the normal *gāthā*-Pāli. Linguistic data suggest an earlier date for the dialogue-stanzas. The uniformity of metre (*Anuṣṭubh Śloka*) is perhaps due to the attempt on the part of the writer of the *ākhyāna* in verse to present a uniform ballad. The striking forms in the dialogue-stanzas are:—Sn. 410, *bhonto*, *brahā* the use of which is entirely restricted to poetry (s.v. PTS.), *pekkhati*; Sn. 411, the *sandhi*, *nīcakulā-m-iva*, which though inorganic is essentially old Pāli; Sn. 421, *anīka* of direct Vedic origin *bhuñjassu*, *akkhāhi*; Sn. 422, the adverbial usage of *ujum* which is archaic (v.l. *ujū*. cp. *Mvastu. nija*- which Neumann calls a misunderstanding of the old Pali) Sn. 423, *kāme abhipatthayaṃ* (a) *abhi* construed with acc. (b) the old p. pr. in *-aṃ*, Sn. 424, *kāmesu*... an historical construction belonging to old Pāli and *daṭṭhu*, irregular archaic absolute.

There exists no *early* prose record of this incident. According to later tradition (SnA. 382 ff., J.I, 66 and DhA. I. 85) the meeting between Seniya Bimbisāra and Gotama took place prior to the Enlightenment. The reference made to him as the Buddha (Sn. 408a) and *cakkhumā* (Sn. 405<sup>b</sup>) need not imply any contradiction, for even prior to the Enlightenment Buddha may be spoken of in such terms by later writers. Yet, the reference here is to the personal Buddha.<sup>3</sup> As a rule, the term as referring to the personal the Buddha was not very popular in the earliest portions of the Canon, where, invariably, he is called Bhagavā or Tathāgata. But its use as, “the Enlightened” or “the Awakened” is early, e.g. S.I. 35, 60, A. IV. 449, Sn. 622, 643, 646, etc. Besides this the occurrence

2. (a) Sn. 406 cp. M.I, 179, S.V. 350, A.II, 208, etc. *sambādho gharāvāso rajā-patho*, *abbhokāso pabbajjā*.

(b) Sn. 417-419 cp. D.I, 50 II. 73, A.V. 65, Vin. I, 231, 242, etc.... *bhaddāni bhaddāni yānāni yojāpetvā*, *Bhaddaṃ yānaṃ abhiruhitvā*, *bhaddehi bhaddehi yānehi*.... *niyyāsi*, *yena*.... *tena pāyāsi*, *yāvatikā yānassa bhūmi yānena gantvā*, *yānā paccorohitvā*, *pattiko*’va *yena bhagavā ten’u pasankami upasaṅkamitvā bhagavatā saddhiṃ sammodi*, *sammodaniyaṃ kathaṃ sārāṇiyaṃ vitisāretva ekamantaṃ nisīdi*.

3. The term Buddha occurs 39 times in the *gāthās* of Sn... As many as 25 refer to the personal Buddha, and the other 14 to Buddha in the impersonal sense. The term Sambuddha is met with 19 times.



of the phrases, *ākiṇṇavāralakkhaṇo* (Sn. 408<sup>d</sup>) and *lakkhaṇasampannaṃ* (Sn. 409<sup>c</sup>) may be accepted as indicative of a certain amount of development in the concept of the Buddha. The nominal forms, *pāsādasmiṃ* (Sn. 409<sup>b</sup>) and *rājino*<sup>4</sup> (Sn. 415<sup>d</sup>) apparently belong to a considerably late stratum of Pāli. All this evidence does not go to prove the lateness of the entire poem, but that probably the narrative verses may not be as old as the rest of the poem. This may still be maintained in spite of the general uniformity of the poem in many respects. It is clear that the event reported in this *sutta* took place prior to the Buddha's Enlightenment (*vide* Sn. 424<sup>c</sup>) and that it was the first time that Bimbisāra met the Buddha. This is further attested to by the strong tradition preserved in the *Nidāna-kathā* of the *Jātaka*.

However, there are a few discrepancies in the poem. The occurrence of the term Buddha at Sn. 408 has already been discussed. It is to be noted that the version of this *sutta* in the *Mahāvastu* (*Mvastu*. II. 198 ff.) does not refer to him as the Buddha. Again according to the *Pabbajjā Sutta*, the Buddha had a following even at this stage—*nāgasāṅgha purakkhato*, Sn. 421. Neither *Mvastu*. nor the condensed version in the *Nidāna-kathā* makes any mention of a following or a *saṅgha*. In fact Sn. 420-421 are represented by only one stanza in *Mvastu*.

*Udagro tvam asi rājñah aśvāroho'va selako/  
dadāmi bhogāṃ bhunjāhi, jātīm cākhyāhi prcchito//*

It may be quite possible that in this instance *Mvastu*. preserves an older tradition while the two stanzas in Sn. indicate an expansion on a different line. This is further borne out by the strange resemblance of Sn. 420<sup>ab</sup> to the oft-recurring prose formula, *daharo hoti, yuvā susu kālakeso*<sup>5</sup> *bhadrena yobbanena samannāgato*... M. I, 82, D, I. 115, A, II, 22, III, 66, etc. Some of these apparent contradictions may be ascribed either to later accretions or to a confusion of the tradition at some early stage. The latter possibility is more plausible when all the other available evidence is taken into consideration.

Though both versions narrate the same event, the Pāli and BSk. show definite signs of independent development from their original source, if such a version did exist. In the case of Pāli this has been effected mainly by the association of the forms of expression and formulae pertaining to the standard prose idiom. Many of the discrepancies in evidence in Sn. can be thus explained on this basis. Two such instances have been

4. The only other occurrence of *rājino* in Sn. is at 209. in the *Brāhmaṇadhammika Sutta*. To say nothing of that *sutta*, but taking Sn. 299 independently, its comparative lateness is evident from the late word *vipallāsa* and the (late?) artificial nominal form *viyākāraṃ* occurring in it.

5. Also *susukālakeso* which is explained by Commentaries as, 'with very black hair'.

noticed earlier (above). The three introductory stanzas are replaced by a brief prose sentence in *Mvastu*, which states that the *Bodhisattva* leaves Ārāḍa Kālāma and repairs to Rājagṛha. There is nothing corresponding to *Sn.* 413 in *Mvastu*. The number of instances in which the *pādas* of this stanza are seen to occur in other Pāli metrical works (Hare, p. 195) perhaps indicates a possible explanation for the presence of this stanza here. The stanza *Sn.* 416 is expanded into two verses in *Mvastu*, and *Sn.* 417 into three. The stanza corresponding to *Sn.* 418 in *Mvastu*, is totally different from the Pāli which bears kinship with the prose formulae. Again, *Sn.* 424<sup>ab</sup> (cp. *Th*1. 458, *Th*2. 226, etc.) has no parallel in BSk. Though the dialogue between Bimbisāra and Buddha (*Sn.* 420-424) is found in a more condensed form in *Mvastu*, it does not end where it stops in *Sn.*, but continues with two more stanzas in which Bimbisāra solicits Buddha's promise to visit him after the Enlightenment.

The story in the *Nidānakathā* (J. I, 66) is not very helpful in the analysis of this *sutta*, as it is even posterior to *SnA*, which it mentions.<sup>6</sup>

Other internal evidence consists of an examination of the places mentioned in the *sutta*. Rājagṛha was connected with Buddha's early career, and was one of the earliest centres of Buddhism. The peak Paṇḍava was situated in the line of hills which formed a natural fortification to the city, giving it the name Giribajja (see also DPPN). The Sākiyas are spoken of as a family of the Āditya clan inhabiting the Himālayan sector of Kosala. Legend has not yet grown round them making them an all powerful clan. They are merely a *kula* in Kosala. This too supports the general antiquity of the poem. However, the evidence at hand shows that the dialogue-stanzas preserve an older stratum than the narrative verses which betray signs of further development. It is quite probable that the three introductory stanzas which cannot be traced in *Mvastu*, were still later than the narrative verses. On account of the general consistency of the poem in language, metre, style and syntax it is not possible to say by what length of time these stanzas were separated; yet it must be agreed with Winternitz that this *sutta* is a precious remnant of the ancient ballad-poetry from which the epic of the life of Buddha developed.

---

6. A comparison of the two is interesting merely from the point of view of tradition. In the *Nidānakathā* the *dūtas* see the Buddha and inform the King, and it is they who speculate whether he is a *deva*, human being etc. . . It is described how the Buddha loathed the meal he obtained by begging alms, and he finally ate it after self-admonition. Bimbisāra visits the Buddha and is impressed by his bearing—*iriyāpathasmim pasīditvā*—and offers him all comforts which the Buddha refuses. He finally solicits a promise from the Buddha to visit Magadha after the Enlightenment. Buddha then goes to Ālāra Kālāma, and Uddaka Rāmaputta and finally practises austerities—*mahāpadhānam padahitukāmo mahāpadhānam padhānesi*. Subsequent events are next recorded in the *Nidānakathā*.



## Padhāna Sutta

The *Padhāna Sutta* appears to be foreshadowed in the last stanza of the *Pabbajjā Sutta*—*padhānāya gamissāmi*, (Sn. 424<sup>c</sup>). The two *suttas* are closely connected with each other, but in spite of Sn. 424<sup>c</sup> it is doubtful whether they aim at a connected narrative, though they ostensibly appear as such. In view of the changes that the *Pabbajjā Sutta* has undergone at editorial hands it may be surmised, though it cannot be established with certainty, that it served as an introductory *sutta* to *Padhāna* in Sn. and that Sn. 424<sup>c</sup> was a mere coincidence. *Mvastu.* hardly throws any light on this, on account of the fact that the *sūtra* there, while preserving some of the primitive characteristics, also shows an expansion on a line different from that of Sn., and besides, some of the sections that are placed between the two *suttas* contain much irrelevant matter (such as *jātakas*). However, it is significant that the next *sutta* in *Mvastu.* deals with incidents following Buddha's departure to Uruvilvā leaving Udraka Rāmaputra. The *pāda*, *padhānāya gamissāmi* is common to both Pāli and BSk. (*prahāṇāya gamiṣyāmi*—*Mvastu.* II, 199<sup>18</sup>), and must necessarily be old, but it seems to have been partially responsible for the prefacing as it were, of the *Padhāna Sutta* with the *Pabbajjā*—besides taking into account the logical sequence of these two surviving ballads.

These two *suttas* represent but two of the major episodes in the eventful period of Buddha's early career, the one, at best being a record of Bimbisāra's first meeting with the Buddha, and hence be more appropriately termed "Bimbisārapratyudgama" (*vide* PBR 1, 3), while the other an allegorical representation in ballad-form, Buddha's conquest of evil. On the strength of the evidence from these two *suttas* alone, the relevant intervening incidents recorded in *Mvastu.*, *SnA.*, *DhA.*, and *Nidānakathā* (J. I, 66), however late some of these accounts may be, cannot be all brushed aside as subsequent accretions in the course of development of the story of the Buddha. Although it is quite obvious that the later accounts are highly embellished versions of the life of the Buddha, the fact that only these two important events of the renunciation and the quest of peace by asceticism are preserved in the form of ballads, neither precludes the possibility of the early existence of more ballads of this nature, nor establishes that these *suttas* contain a complete record of Buddha's early sojourn as an ascetic. Yet, "the wholesome austerity" as pointed out by Chalmers (p. xix) evinced in these *suttas* gives them precedence over all other extant accounts.

The *Padhāna Sutta*, like its companion poem, the *Pabbajjā Sutta*, is a narrative incorporating dialogue-stanzas. The occurrence of the 1st person in the opening stanza (*Sn.* 425<sup>a</sup>—*maṃ*) cannot be reconciled with the 3rd person in the narrative at *Sn.* 429<sup>cd</sup>,

*imā gāthā bhaṇaṃ Māro aṭṭhā Buddhassa santike.*

It has been correctly pointed out by Katre that *maṃ* is an error for *naṃ*, which has its antecedent at *Sn.* 408<sup>a</sup>.<sup>7</sup> The fact that this line has no exact parallel in *Mvastu*. makes the verification of Katre's suggestion rather difficult; and furthermore, the uniformity of the Pāli Mss. which read *maṃ* throughout shows that the "error" has set in at a very early stage. This confusion is also noticeable in *Mvastu*. though the exact parallels are not found there. (The account at *Lal.* 299 ff. is of no value as it offers no parallel to *Sn.* or any other Pāli version). The opening stanza in *Mvastu*. reads, *prahāṇaṃ prahitaṃ mayā* (II, 238<sup>4</sup>), but the narrative reverts to the 3rd person in the sixth stanza,

*imāṃ vācāṃ bhaṇe Māro, Bodhisattvasya santike.*

This coincidence, besides establishing for certain the common origin of the two versions throws some light on the narrative element in this *sutta*. A glance at the *sutta* shows that it contains comparatively few narrative stanzas. (*viz.* *Sn.* 425, 426<sup>ab</sup>, 429<sup>cd</sup> 430<sup>ab</sup> and 449) as contrasted with *Pabbajjā Sutta*. The dialogue-stanzas at *Sn.* 425<sup>ab</sup>-429<sup>ab</sup> can be taken as forming three complete stanzas; thus;

1. *Kiso tvam asi dubbaṇṇo, santike maraṇaṃ tava,  
sahassabhāgo maraṇassa, ekaṃso tava jīvitaṃ.*
2. *Jīva bho, jīvitaṃ seyyo, jīvaṃ puñṇāni kāhasi,  
carato ca te brahmacariyaṃ aggihuttaṃ ca jūhato.*
3. *Pahūtaṃ cīyate puñṇaṃ, kiṃ padhānena kāhasi.  
Duggo maggo padhānāyu dukkaro durabhisambhavo.*

Similarly *Sn.* 430<sup>cd</sup> and 431 can conveniently form a stanza of six *pādas* like *Sn.* 434. (It is not possible to arrange *Sn.* 430<sup>cd</sup>-434<sup>ef</sup> into five stanzas without breaking up complete sentences and disturbing the harmony of the poem). It is quite probable that at some stage the *sutta* consisted of only the dialogue, the narrative stanzas being a versification of older prose. The presence of narrative verses in *Mvastu*. makes it quite clear that this has taken place at a very early stage. The confusion in the narrative may be ascribed to that same period.

7. Neumann (*Reden*, p. 469) equates *taṃ maṃ* to *taṃ' maṃ* (= *taṃ* is *am*—anaphoric, like so 'haṃ) which is a brilliant suggestion which explains the whole discrepancy, though the exact idiom is not to be met with elsewhere.



The opening dialogue-stanzas quoted above are the words of Māra, and Buddha's reply commences at *Sn.* 430<sup>cd</sup> and ends at *Sn.* 440. The next five stanzas are in the form of a soliloquy, and the end of *Sn.* 443 marks the complete defeat of Māra, while *Sn.* 444-445 constitute the "victorious resolution of the hero" (Katre). The next three stanzas representing Māra's acknowledgment of defeat appear to be a subsequent addition. They are not found in *Mvastu.*; but it is stated at S.I, 122 that Māra was on the Buddha's trail for seven years waiting for an opportunity to seize him, but with no success—*olārāpekkho, olāraṃ alabhamāno*. Later, in the same section (S. I, 124), he acknowledges defeat and utters the identical stanzas at *Sn.* 447-448. It is quite probable that *Sn.* 446 is a versification of a passage corresponding to that at S. I, 122 while the next two stanzas were perhaps taken from the same source as S. The final stanza of the poem (*Sn.* 449) roughly corresponds to that in *Mvastu*, and forms the narrator's conclusion.

There is no doubt that the *sutta* is old, but the whole of it cannot be assigned the same antiquity. Some austerities practised by the Buddha are mentioned at M. I, 242 ff. Here the Buddha relates how he gradually gave up self-mortification and fasting. He took food in gradual quantities till he became strong again. The *pañcavaggiyas* left him saying, *bāhuliko samaṇo Gotama, padhānavibbhanto āvatto bāhullāya*. ("The ascetic Gotama has swerved from his austerities and has reverted to a life of luxury"—M. I, 247, cp. M. I, 17-24, 114-118, 167, etc). Then he evolved the four *jhānas* and realised the three *vijjās*. There is no mention of Māra in the *Majjhima* account. S. I, 103 speaks of Māra as having visited him when he was seated at the foot of the Ajapāla banyan tree, after attaining Enlightenment. *Lal.* devotes a whole section (*Māradharṣaṇa-parivartaḥ*—*Lal.* 299-343) to the Buddha's conquest of Māra. (S. I, 124 will be discussed later). Besides these there are numerous late accounts which deal with this topic in great detail, e.g. J. I, 71 ff. *BvA.* 239, *SnA.* 391, *DhA.* II 195, etc. Actual battles are spoken of between the legions of Māra and the Buddha, and many of the late accounts make *pāramitās* combat Māra.

The only version which bears a close resemblance to the *Padhāna Sutta* is the section at *Mvastu.* II, 237 ff. Their common origin has already been hinted at. Among the numerous incidents reported in *Mvastu.* between the two *sūtras* corresponding to *Pabbajjā* and *Padhāna*, there occurs a description of severe austerities practised by the Buddha (II, 231 ff.). It is stated that he lived on one *kola* (Pāli, *kaḷāya*?) a *tila* and a *taṇḍula* each a day for three successive periods of 18 months each, and no food at all for a further period of 18 months making up a total of six

years which agrees with all other accounts (cp. *Nidānakathā*). An old parallel to this is found at M. I, 245; *thokaṃ thokaṃ āhāraṃ āhāresim, pasataṃ pasataṃ yadi vā muggayūsaṃ, yadi vā kulatthayūsaṃ-pe-*.

The prose introduction to the *Prahāṇa Sūtra* occurs at *Mvastu*. II, 237, in which it is stated that the Evil One visited the *Bodhisattva* while he was practising; austerities (*duṣkaracārikaṃ carantaṃ*) at Uruvilvā on the banks of the Nairāñjanā. Comparing this narrative with M. I, 245 the striking similarity in the essentials, leaving aside the extraneous matter in the former, is the common basis of their origin that they point to. The main purpose of the narrative in *Mvastu*. being the linking up of various *jātakas* it is very unlikely that much attention was paid to the narration of the present story. This being the case exaggeration and poetic embellishment find no place in this part of *Mvastu*.

It is significant that it contains no passages corresponding to *Sn.* 427<sup>rb</sup>, 438<sup>cd</sup>, 440, 441<sup>cd</sup>, 442, 443<sup>ab</sup>, 444<sup>c</sup>, 445<sup>cb</sup>, and 446-448. Of these *Sn.* 427<sup>ab</sup> is a descriptive line emphasising the odds against Gotama, while 438<sup>cd</sup> is a phrase found in a slightly different form in prose, *attānaṃ ukkaṃseti pare vambheti*, M.I. 402, A. II, 27, etc. and is probably an importation to the *sutta*. This is further strengthened by the phrase *lābho siloko saṅkāro* (*Sn.* 438<sup>a</sup>) which closely resembles the familiar phrase *lābhasaṅkārasilokānisaṃsā*, whereas *Mvastu*. reads *lobha* for *lābha* (probably a scribe's error).

The absence of the stanza *Sn.* 440 in *Mvastu*, its rhetorical effect lending a realistic touch, and the occurrence of line cd. at Th1, 194, J. VI, 495 make it appear rather suspicious in the eyes of the reader. Scholars have discussed at great length the phrase, *esa muñjaṃ parihare*. ('Look you, I bear the *muñja* grass'—Neumann, *esa*=*Du da*, Hare, 'See, I bear *muñja* grass'). Otto Schrader (JRAS. 1930, pp. 107-109) refers to Pischel's misinterpretation of the phrase as *Ich verschmähe das Schilfrohr* ('I refuse to take the reed'); so does Oldenberg reject it (ZDMG 1908, p. 594). He quotes five passages from *Gobhila Gṛhya Sūtra*, *Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra* and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* to show the connection of *pariharati* with *muñja-mekhalā* or *muñjayoktra*—i.e. wearing a girdle. Dr. Schrader disagrees with Oldenberg's view that *Sn.* 440-442 is a soliloquy interrupting the direct speech of the Bodhisattva to Māra and says that these verses are calculated to frighten Māra though *Sn.* 442 may not seem to be directly addressed to him. Basing his argument on *Sn.* 431<sup>d</sup> he says *Māraṃ* here is a poetical substitute for *Māra tvam* and interprets the phrase as 'I take this vow (to conquer or to die, caring nothing for life)'; cp *SnA.* 39. K. Chaṭṭopādhyāya (JRAS 1930, pp. 897-898) agrees with Schrader but prefers to translate it as 'I gird up my loins' (which meant that he



would use his utmost vigour in his spiritual fight). He equates the passage to *Eṣo' ham parikaram badhnāmi* (*Veṇisaṃhāra* IV).

The section *Sn.* 439-444 is represented by only four lines at *Mvastu.* II, 240, and bears definite signs of enlargement. Judging from the fact that it was not customary for *Mvastu.* to summarise and condense, and that it often contains expansions of passages found in brief in Pāli it cannot be said that *Mvastu.* here contains a summary. The absence of a stanza corresponding to *Sn.* 442 in BSk. and the fact that it consistently refers to a real army and not an allegorical representation as in *Sn.* 436-438, are probable indications of the lateness of this stanza. *Sn.* 445<sup>ab</sup> appears as a familiar expression adapted from the prose. The section *Sn.* 446-448 has already been dealt with (above). Thus, many of the lines in *Sn.* which have nothing corresponding to them in BSk. appear to be poetical flashes for embellishment which perhaps did not belong to the earliest form of this *sutta* on which were based the two versions in Pāli and BSk.

The *Mvastu.* too shows an expansion, which however, as in the case of the *Pabbajjā Sutta* has proceeded in a different direction from that in *Sn.* Besides numerous other *pādas* and parts of stanzas which have no counterpart in *Sn.* the stanza immediately preceding the concluding verse does not occur in *Sn.*, but can be traced in *Dh.* 26<sup>ab</sup> and *Thl.* 883. An instance of a divergence in simile is seen in *āmapātraṃ va ambunā* which is meant to correspond to *āmaṃ pattaṃ va amhanā* (*Sn.* 443<sup>d</sup>). Again, *Sn.* 446-448 need further investigation. If *Sn.* has borrowed the last two stanzas of this section from S. it follows that this part of the *Padhāna Sutta* is later than the *Māra Saṃyutta*. Taking into account the propensities of Buddhist writers to incorporate *gāthās* wherever possible, it would seem natural that S. should also contain *Sn.* 446 in verse. From this it may be deduced that *Sn.* 446 was not known in *gāthā*-form by the time of the compilation of the *Māra Saṃyutta*. Hence any inference that *Sn.* has directly borrowed them from S. would be erroneous.

On the other hand, from the aspect of the development of the Māra-legend S. I, 124 appears later than *Sn.* Here three of Māra's *senās* in *Sn.* *taṇhā*, *arati* (cp. *ārati* BSk.) and *kāmā* (viz. fourth, second and first) are personified as his three daughters Taṇhā, Arati and Ragā who attempt to allure the Buddha. Thus, on the whole the *Māra Saṃyutta* appears to be later than *Sn.*

Judging from the fact that *Sn.* 446-448 are not known to *Mvastu.* it may be inferred that at some stage the concluding stanza *Sn.* 449 occurred immediately after *Sn.* 445 and that with the introduction of the new stanzas the concluding narrative verse was shifted to occupy its present position. The *pāda* b, *vīṇā kacchā abhassatha* ("the lute fell from his arm-pit")

suggests a confusion of legend, the origin of *vīṇā* seems obvious. The Commentary (*SnA.* 393-394) states that it was this *vīṇā* (called *paṇḍu*) that Sakka presented with to Pañcasikha. Yet, this does not solve the question of how Māra came by a *vīṇā*. The parallel *pīṇā* in *Mvastu*, which reads, *vināśaṃ gacchi ucchriti* ('his pride was all shattered'), probably expresses the original idea that may have existed, prior to the importation of the *vīṇā* from the developed legend which speaks of his daughters as playing instrumental music as a part of their wiles. This phrase perhaps dating not earlier than the time of the incorporation of *Sn.* 446-448, a confusion as it may seem, is at best a master touch of poetic fancy bringing the *sutta* to a dramatic climax.

An examination of the *internal evidence* from language and syntax, metre and ideology confirms what has been already noticed. The idiom throughout is old *gāthā-Pāli*, and from the point of syntax the following expressions depict a very old idiom:—*Nadiṃ Nerañjaraṃ pati-Sn.* 425<sup>b</sup>,... *seyyo...yañ ce...-Sn.* 440<sup>cd</sup>, *mā maṃ thānā acāvayi-Sn.* 442<sup>d</sup>; etc. The *sutta* is full of archaic nominal and verbal forms e.g. *Namuci* (for Māra) -*Sn.* 426<sup>a</sup>, 439<sup>a</sup>, which is old Vedic (Neumann, p. 469), *amhanā-Sn.* 443<sup>d</sup>, *kāhasi -Sn.* 427<sup>d</sup>, 428<sup>d</sup> (<*kārṣya*- Geiger, 54.4, 153.1), *socare -Sn.* 445<sup>d</sup>, *nādhigacchissam -Sn.* 446<sup>c</sup> (*iṣ-* Aor.), *aṭṭhā -Sn.* 429<sup>d</sup>, *anupariyagā -Sn.* 447<sup>b</sup> (√Aor.), p.pr. *bhaṇam -Sn.* 429<sup>c</sup>, and *vinayaṃ -Sn.* 444<sup>d</sup>, etc.

The metre throughout is old *Anuṣṭubh Śloka*. The few metrical irregularities are:—*anacrusis* at *Sn.* 428<sup>a</sup>, 431<sup>a</sup>, *even quarters* at *Sn.* 435<sup>a</sup>, 440<sup>a</sup>, 443<sup>a</sup>, 428<sup>a</sup>, 439<sup>c</sup> and 444<sup>c</sup>.

No developments in doctrine are noticeable. The thought and ideas embodied in the *sutta* are distinctively old. Confidence (*saddhā*) and *virīya* and *paññā -Sn.* 432 have no special technical significance which is to be seen even in very early works. Other qualities mentioned are, *cittappasāda*, *sati* and *samādhi - Sn.* 434. The severe austerities referred to at *Sn.* 433-434 are characteristic of the times. Another important concept is *yogakkhema* (already discussed) which has been seen to pertain to the earliest phase of Buddhism. Māra is called *yakkha* at *Sn.* 449.

All this evidence shows that the *sutta* is old as a whole; but as observed earlier, *Sn.* 446-448 should be considered as being later than the rest of the poem. It is also probable, from the analogy of the *Pabbajjā Sutta*, that the narrative element in verse need not have formed an integral part of the poem and that the nucleus of the *sutta* was the dialogue.



## Nālaka Sutta

The *Nālaka Sutta* consists of two parts, the introductory *vatthu-gāthā* (Sn. 679-698) and the dialogue-discourse (Sn. 699-723) dealing with *moneyya*—the state of a *muni*. As the *vatthu-gāthā* present a multiplicity of problems they call for separate attention. Generally, introductions to old Pāli ballads are considerably later than the poems themselves (*vide* PBR 1, 2, p. 86 and *vide* E. J. Thomas, *Life of Buddha*, p. 38). It will be seen that this is clearly borne out by the *vatthu-gāthā* in spite of the fact that they are in verse (also cp. *vatthu-gāthā* of *Pārāyana*). Unlike the introductions to many other *suttas* which narrate the incidents leading up to their preaching, these *gāthās* have little bearing on the *sutta* proper. There is a difference in point of time in the sequence of events in the two parts of the *sutta*. As regards characters in the v.g, a close parallel is offered by the *Pārāyana Vagga*, for Nālaka plays the same rôle as Piṅgiya in *Pār* (*vatthu-gāthā*, *pucchā* and epilogue) while Asita's position here is very similar to that of Bāvarī.

Despite the slender connection between the two parts, the internal and external evidence establishes beyond doubt that a fusion of two independent ballads has taken place, as in the case of the *Sela Sutta* (Sn. pp. 102 ff.<sup>8</sup>) and that the two components were separated in point of time.<sup>9</sup>

The language, style and metre of the *vatthu-gāthā* differ considerably from those of the *sutta* proper. At the same time there is a marked tendency towards the growth of a developed Buddha-legend, which is totally absent in the discourse. This is evident from the reference to the thirty-two marks (*vide* E. J. Thomas, *ibid.*) and the occurrence of the term Bodhisatta at Sn. 683.<sup>10</sup> The general tone of this part of the *sutta* with its description of the devas rejoicing at the birth of the Buddha and Asita's prophecy is that of a later piece.

*Language and style.*—There are many late and Sanskritic forms lying side by side with equally numerous very old forms: e.g. *cittimkaritvā*, *atiriva kalyarūpo* (Sn. 680), *lomahaṃsano*, *marū* (Sn. 681), *manussaloke*, *hitasukhatāya* (Sn. 683), the epithets in Sn. 684, *avaṃsari* (an analogical form -Sn. 685), *sikhī*—fire—, the simile in the lines be (Sn. 687), *paṭiggahe*

8. *Vide* Katre. He states that the intervening prose between Sn. 567 and 568 is "solely due to the fusion" of two different ballads.

9. *Vide* E. J. Thomas, *ibid*, p. 39 "The question of the *sutta* is quite different from the question of the origin of the legend (Asita's) and its becoming attached to this *sutta*."

10. Though "the Bodhisattva doctrine probably originated in the second century B.C." (Har Dayal—*The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*, p. 43) the term is older; but it does not reflect the oldest stratum of thought in Pāli Buddhism.

(an artificial form -Sn. 689), *Sakyapuṅgavaṃ* (Sn. 690), *gamaṇaṃ* (= *maraṇaṃ*), *akalyarūpo* (Sn. 691), the *sandhis*, *isi-m-avoca*, *cāpi-m-assa*, the phrase *adhimanasā bhavātha* (Sn. 692), *kālakiriyā*, *asamodhura* (Sn. 694), and *hīlamanasena* (Sn. 697). While the late forms suggest a date for the *vatthu-gāthā* the old and archaic forms handed down from an older period as the standard vehicle of poetic expression require no comment. The *sutta* itself (*Nālaka*-discourse) is marked by a total absence of late forms.

The *style* of the discourse is quite different from that of the *vatthu-gāthā*. The miraculous and the semi-supernatural element is a dominant feature in the latter. The narrative in addition to its highly ornate character is extravagantly descriptive and abounds in simile and metaphor, e.g. Sn. 686-687, etc. There are also instances of the same statement being repeated in similar words, e.g. Sn. 687, 689, which have the appearance of commentarial gloss. The *sutta* proper is written in a much simpler style.

**Metre.** The *Sutta* proper (Sn. 699-723) is in uniform *Śloka* metre like the *Pabbajjā* and *Padhāna Suttas* while the *vatthu-gāthā* are in a jumble of metres i.e. Sn. 681, 682, 684, 688-690 (except 688<sup>b</sup>) are in *Triṣṭubh* with *jagati pādas*, and Sn. 679-680, 683, 685-687, 691-698 are in a metre of their own with the *Triṣṭubh* rhythm continued. Though it is generally held that historically, the *Śloka* metre is later than the *Triṣṭubh* it need not necessarily imply that these *ślokas* are later than the *Triṣṭubh* verses in the *vatthu-gāthā*. The divergence in metre is perhaps additional proof of the difference in the periods of composition of the two parts.

### External Evidence:

The story of the Buddha's nativity in the *vatthu-gāthā* agrees in general with the versions in *Lalitāvistara*, *Mahāvastu*, the Tibetan *Dulva* and the *Nidānakathā* (*Jātaka*), but differs considerably in details. E. J. Thomas (*Life of Buddha*, pp. 38 ff.) has made a comparative study of this and no attempt is made here to go into any details. The verse-recension which follows the prose at Lal. 101 ff. has no connection whatsoever with the *Nālaka*-discourse in Sn. but is merely a different version of the prose legend with enlargements and details which differ to some extent. Unlike the prose these verses bear no close resemblance to the *vatthu-gāthā*. The points of interest in this account are:—1. Asita's nephew is Nara-datta and not Nālaka as in Sn. 2. There are more miracles, but the Bodhisattva does not plant his feet on Asita's forehead as at J. I, 55. 3. Asita sees with divine eye—*dibbacakkhu*—the birth of the Buddha and informs his nephew of it declaring the only two courses of action open to such



a being. 4. He takes his nephew with him to Kapilavāstu and interviews Śuddhodana and not the Śākyas as in *Sn.* 5. The thirty-two major characteristics are dealt with in great detail. 6. After his pronouncement that the new born babe would become the Buddha he returns to the *āśrama* and advises Naradatta to follow the Buddha when the time comes.

The version in *Mvastu.* which agrees with the *vatthu-gāthā* is found quite apart from the *Nālaka*-discourse, viz. *Mvastu.* II. 30 ff. and III, 382 ff. (in both prose and verse respectively). Here Asita, the *ṛṣi* from Ujjayini goes to Kapilavāstu with his pupils including Nālaka who later in the account is also called Nārada. In details, the account is similar to that in *Lal.* Although the *naimittikas*, “soothsayers” declare that the young prince would become a *cakravartin*, Asita is certain of his becoming the Buddha. There are a few other miracles such as the birth of 500 each of girls, boys, male and female slaves, etc. simultaneous with that of the Bodhisattva. The verses that follow (pp. 33-43) deal more elaborately with the same incident. Asita advises Nārada to practise the *brahmacaryā* under the Buddha. The version at *Mvastu.* III, 382 ff. will be discussed later. It is also noteworthy that the Buddha’s interlocutor here is called Nālaka Kātyāyana (p. 386) who on the advice of his father, the *purohita* to king Tonehāra seeks ordination (by the formula, *ehi bhikṣu*).

According to the Tibetan account at *Dulva*, III. f. 461 ff. (Rockhill, *Life of the Buddha*, pp. 17 ff.) it is the statue of the *yakṣa* Śākyavardhana that bows down at the child’s feet and not the hermit as in J. The *ṛṣi* Akleśa (=Asita—Rockhill) the dweller on the Sarvadhāra mountain, with his nephew Nalada goes to see the infant Bodhisattva. He predicts the child’s future and advises his nephew to enter the Sākyan order when the time comes. The *Dulva* further states that Nalada became known as Kātyāyana among the 500 brahmins whom he joined at Benares, and that after his conversion by the Buddha he was called “the great member of Kātya’s family”. Thus, an attempt is made here to identify him with Mahākātyāyana (cp. *Mvastu.* III, 386 Nālaka Kātyāyana).

The *Nidānakathā* (J. I. 54 ff.) which decidedly shows signs of being much later than the BSk. accounts contains a great many details and abounds in miracles. The story, agrees fundamentally with the other versions. The name of the aged visitor is Kāḷa-devala, ‘Devala the Black’ (Asita=Kāḷa). He is a *tāpasa*, ‘a hermit’ from Avanti Dakkhiṇāpatha (Ujjeni, cp. *Mvastu.*) and not an *ṛṣi*. As in the *Dulva* the exact time of the Buddha’s enlightenment is stated (viz. after thirty-five years).

Among other references to Asita in the Pāli Canon is the mention of Asita-devala at M. II, 155 whom Malalasekera (s.v., DPPN) attempts to

identify with Kāḷadevala an ascetic of Arañjarā whose younger brother was Nārada. In the *Samodhāna* of the *Indriva Jātaka* (J. III, 469) Kāḷadevala is identified with Kaccāna which perhaps indicates a distant echo of Nālaka Kātyāyana in *Mvastu.* or Mahākātyāyana of the *Dulva* (*vide* Rockhill, *ibid.*, pp. 18, 45). There is also mention made of Nārada of Arañjagiri in Majjhimappadesa, the younger brother of Kāḷadevala at J. III, 463 ff. and V, 133 ff.

The relatively early existence of the account is evident from the diverse accounts which present a uniformity in essentials. The more elaborate versions in BSk. with all their embellishments are decidedly later than the *vatthu-gāthā*. Needless to say the *Nidānakathā* and the *Dulva* are much younger than the BSk. However, the general consistency suggests a common origin to all these accounts. Though it is said that there is no evidence to show that the legend itself was pre-Christian (Thomas, *ibid.*) this alone is no proof of its being so late as that. It may have had an independent existence long before it came to be fixed in some definite form in the *vatthu-gāthā*. There is no reason to exclude the *vatthu-gāthā* from the *Sutta Nipāta* that was known to the author of *Milp.* (*vide* *Milp.* 411, 414, etc.). Thus it is quite probable that this legend existed in pre-Christian times. At the same time it cannot be disputed that it was later than the *sutta* proper.

Internal evidence has shown that it belongs to a younger stratum than the *Nālaka*-discourse. The fact that it has little bearing on the latter is further proof of its being an accretion at editorial hands, as was noted in the case of the *vatthu-gāthā* of the *Pārāyana Vagga*. The independent accounts in *Lal.*, *Mvastu.*, *Nidānakathā* and *Dulva*, though they may be much later than *Sn.*, further testify to the fact that the two parts of the *sutta* known as *Nālaka Sutta* in *Sn.* are in reality two independent poems differing in age, brought together at a subsequent date which, most probably, coincided with that of the final collation of *Sn.*

The identity of Nālaka is made rather obscure by his being referred to as Nālaka Kātyāyana at *Mvastu.* III, 386 ff. Nālaka Kātyāyana's conversion at *Dulva* XI, f. 118 ff. (Rockhill, *op. cit.* 45-46) found quite independently of the story of the nativity shares something in common with the introduction to the *Mauneya Sūtra* of *Mvastu.*, for, the episode of the Nāga Elapatra occurs in both of them. Yet, the individual in question is no other than Nālaka of the Pāli *sutta*. Nārada of J. III, 463 and V. 133, ff. is quite distinct from Nālaka. Similarly it is doubtful whether Asitadevala of M. II, 155 who had a younger brother Nārada was Asita of the *vatthu-gāthā*. Perhaps the identification of Kāḷadevala at J. III, 469 with Kaccāna and the mention of Asitadevala may have been respon-



sible for the name Kāḷadevala (of Ujjeni) in the *Nidānākathā* instead of Asita as in other versions.<sup>11</sup> However, it is almost self-evident that with the passage of time and the spread of the story various confusions have set in as a result of the influence of foreign legends.

Various attempts have been made by scholars to establish a connection between the nativity-legends in Buddhism and Christianity. In the circumstances of the birth of Christ, Bunsen,<sup>12</sup> Seydel<sup>13</sup> and Lillie<sup>14</sup> see an echo of the story of the Buddha's birth. C. F. Aiken<sup>15</sup> an American theologian, sees in all these works 'spurious evidence used to impugn the originality of the Gospels'. E. J. Thomas (*op. cit.*) notes that Seydel, Edmunds and Pischel see in the story in *Sn.* the original story of Simeon (Luke, ii, 22-32) and that according to the latter<sup>16</sup> (Pischel) the differences between the two stories are less than their correspondence. Windisch, in *Festschrift Kuhn* has traced Asitadevala back to Brahmanical literature. He regards it 'not absolutely proved that the Simeon of St. Luke owes his existence to the Asita of the Buddhist legend'. This subject is discussed at length by Edmunds in his *Buddhist and Christian Gospels*, by Windisch in *Buddha's Geburt*, and by J. Kennedy in *JRAS* 1917, pp. 209 ff., 469 ff. Whatever similarities there are in these two stories Thomas has pointed out clearly the differences between them (*ibid.*).

As noted earlier it is quite probable that this story was incorporated in the traditional accounts of the life of the Buddha in pre-Christian times. Thus, any suggestion of a borrowing on the part of Christianity or of a common origin prior to the birth of Christianity might cast serious aspersions on the originality and uniqueness of the legendary sections of the Gospel which many writers have endeavoured to maintain. If there has been any borrowing at all both the Indo-Aryans in Madhyadeśa and the Jews in ancient Israel may have probably drawn from a common source. However, the greater probability is that both stories may have originated independently of each other, and that they are merely parallel developments in the course of growth in the two respective religions.

### The Nālaka-discourse:

The *sutta* itself dealing with *moneyya*, as observed earlier, preceded the composition of the *vatthu-gāthā*. The contents of the discourse with the emphasis on the conduct of a *muni* which points to a society of forest-dwelling ascetics, are indicative of its early origin. It prescribes the rules

11. *Sn.* 689 refers to Asita as Kaṇhasiri and *SnA.* 487 as Kaṇhadevala.

12. E. von Bunsen, *The Angel-Messiah of Buddhists, Essenes and Christians*, p. 34.

13. R. Seydel, *Das Evangetium von Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha*, p. 136.

14. A. Lillie, *Influence of Buddhism on Primitive Christianity*, p. 26.

15. *The Dhamma of Gotama Buddha and the Gospel of Jesus Christ*, p. xiv.

16. Pischel *Leberi und Lebre des Buddha*, p. 23 II.

and modes of conduct for the monk, and therefore belongs to that category of *suttas* in *Sn.* designated as the “*muni-class*”. There is a higher ethical basis underlying the *sutta*; and this is much more pronounced than even in the *Muni* and *Sammāparibbājaniya Suttas*. It has the same tone as the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* and agrees with its ethical values which have a special reference to the *bhikkhu*.

No detailed observations need be made on the language, style and metre of the *sutta*. A few casual remarks, however, have to be made on the ideology. On its own merits, the *sutta* recommends itself as an early poem, for all internal evidence clearly indicates it. The language is old and preserves several archaic forms many of which are poetic. Unlike the *vatthu gāthā* it contains no late forms. The ideas in the *sutta* share much in common with contemporary Indian thought. Neumann (*Reden*, p. 504 ff.) has made a comprehensive study of this giving many parallels. The stanzas *Sn.* 702, 703, 705, 711, 712, 713, 714, 720-722 are outstanding examples of ideas common to all literature of the period, though the thought throughout the *sutta* is more characteristic of an ascetic sect. However, a distinctive Buddhistic strain runs through the whole poem. Yogic practices are mentioned in *Sn.* 716, and in the above mentioned stanzas are to be seen echoes of the Brāhmanas and the Upanisads.

Although there are several accounts of the Buddha's nativity in Pāli and BSk. literature, the only version which bears a close resemblance to the *Nālaka*-discourse in *Sn.* is to be found at *Mvastu*. III, 386 ff. Practically the whole discourse occurs in similar words with a few changes, which however, do not show much divergence from the Pāli. The order of the 24 stanzas in *Mvastu*. is different from that of the 25 stanzas in *Sn.* There is nothing in the BSk. version corresponding to *Sn.* 718; and the stanzas parallel to *Sn.* 709 and 714 bear only a vague resemblance to them. *Sn.* 706 is slightly expanded in BSk. while *Sn.* 708<sup>ab</sup>, 707<sup>ab</sup> and 708<sup>cd</sup>, 709<sup>cd</sup> respectively form two stanzas and *Sn.* 719<sup>a</sup> has no parallel at all. The other noteworthy changes are :—*Sn.* 702<sup>d</sup>//*kṣānto cānumato bhava*, *Sn.* 711<sup>a</sup> *āgamma//āsādyā*, *Sn.* 711<sup>d</sup> *payutaṃ //prepsutaṃ* *Sn.* 708<sup>b</sup> *abhihārayc// abhirakṣaye*, *Sn.* 715<sup>a</sup> *visatā//saritā*; *Sn.* 716<sup>a</sup>//*evaṃ mauneyaṃ upesyasi* and *Sn.* 714<sup>ab</sup>// *na pāraṃ dviguṇāyati nā' pi caiva guṇāyati*.

The close resemblance these two versions bear to each other suggests that they are but two recensions of the same discourse. It may be probable that the Pāli version is older than the BSk., but it cannot be supposed that the latter is based on the former. The only justifiable conclusion is that they had a common origin. Besides this there are several *Moneyya Suttas* in the Pāli Canon. *Anguttara Nikāya* I, 273 contains a short *sutta* dealing with the three *moneyyas*, *kāya*, *vacī* and *mano*, entitled



*Moneyya Sutta*. The abstention from the three *akusalas* arising from these three sources is termed *moneyya* and the *sutta* is concluded with the stanza,

*kāyamuniṃ vācāmuniṃ celomuniṃ nāsavaṃ  
muniṃ moneyyasam pannaṃ āhu sabbappahāyinaṃ.*

*Itivuttaka* III, iii, 8 (It. 56) contains a more concise version of the same *sutta*. It mentions the three *moneyyas* and concludes with the same stanza as at A. I, 273, but with the last *pāda* altered into *āhu niṇhātapāpakaṃ*. The ten abstentions are not enumerated here. *Saṅgiti Sutta* (D. III, 220) merely mentions the three *moneyyas* together with other groups of threes.

Although the *Nālaka Sutta* neither specifies the three *moneyyas* under *kāya*, *vacī* and *mano*, nor enumerates them as the ten abstentions all that and much more is implied in it. The discourse covers a wider range than the limited scope of the *sutta* at A. I, 273. In addition to the abstentions (Sn. 704-706) there are positive injunctions on the mode of conduct of a monk. The absence of a well defined classification, and the emphasis which still lay on the life of the *muni*, the forest-living recluse, are also indicative of the *Nālaka*-discourse being anterior to the *suttas* mentioned above.

It has already been observed that Asoka's *Moneya-sūte* was the *Nālaka Sutta* PBR 1, 3p. 138. Mrs. Kays Davids (*Manual*, pp. 312-314) identifies the fifth *dharmapaliyāya* with it. III, iii, 8 (It. 367 is evidently a misprint for It. No. 67), and Winternitz (*op. cit.* I, 607) accepts it. The alternative name of this *sutta* was the *Moneyya Sutta* (*Mvastu. Mauneya*), and it is most improbable that Asoka would have meant either It. 56 or A. I, 273 by his *Moneya-sūte*, for there is nothing remarkable about these two pieces whereas *Nālaka Sutta* has every claim to it. The thought and sentiments in it are so lofty that it had to be included in the list with its companion poem the *Muni Sutta*. Besides this, the musical *Śloka* metre may have also been responsible for its popularity, for as stated earlier (*ibid.*) a *sutta* in verse would naturally have been preferred to a passage in prose. Hence Mookerji's suggestion (*Asoka*, p. 118n) that by *Moneya-sūte* was meant the *Nālaka Sutta* should be accepted.<sup>17</sup>

(continued)

17. The suggestion that Asoka's *Moneya-sūte* meant the *Thera*-and *Therī-Gāthā* (Max Walleiser) is untenable.

# A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUTTA NIPATA

N. A. Jayawickrama

## Some Suttas from the Aṭṭhaka Vagga

68

### Kāma Sutta

The *Kāma Sutta* which appears at the head of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* presents many problems. The four *suttas* consisting of eight stanzas each and called *Aṭṭhakas* by the compilers follow the *Kāma Sutta*. Judging from the evidence furnished by Pali sources alone, the natural inference is that these are the *true Aṭṭhakas* and the *vagga* including the rest of the *suttas* was named after them. The possibility of an alternative explanation has been suggested earlier.

As said above these four *Aṭṭhakas* form one group and the rest of the *suttas* form the other group (or groups). It is not possible to say whether these four *suttas* formed the foundation on which the superstructure of the rest of the *vagga* was built, or whether they formed an ornamental carving on the already existing edifice of the *vagga*, finally providing those characteristics which supplied the name to the *vagga* which it now bears. Linguistic evidence may perhaps furnish a clue to its solution.

The stanzas are examined individually below:—

Sn. 766; the cognate use in *kāmaṃ kāmayamānassa* (v. i. *kāmayānassa*) is old and poetic and is of restricted usage in subsequent literature; *ce* as a conditional conjunctive as in 767<sup>a</sup> is restricted to *gāthā*. The ellipsis in *pada* 6 is *metri causa*. The *pada* has the ring of an old *gāthā*, specially the emphatic particle used.

Sn. 767; The medial ppr. *kāmayānassa* is old *gāthā* from Vedic origin. The gender of *kāma* is uncertain in this *sutta*; *kāmā* alternates with *kāmāni* (771<sup>b</sup>). Of the 5 instances the word occurs in the *sutta* it is decidedly masc. at 768<sup>a</sup> and 769<sup>a</sup> and probably masc. in this stanza (though traditional grammarians recognise an —ā form in the neut. pl.). It may be either masc. or neut. at Sn. 766<sup>a</sup> (acc. sg.), but is neuter at 771<sup>b</sup> though the pronoun referring to it seems to recognize it as masc. (but *te* is occasionally used as neut. pl. nom. and acc.). The verb. *ruppati* dates back to an “r-dialect” in Vedic. (Cl. Sk. has *l-√rup*, *lump*). It is most frequently used in this period (cf. S. I. 198; 7<sup>th</sup> 1, 967; Sn. 331, etc.) and is not met with in later literature except in grammatical works in which a fanciful etymology is suggested for *rūpa*.



Sn. 768; *padā* is a shorter Vedic inst. sg. and *sīro* is the Vedic acc. sg. (historical) as opposed to Pāli *sirasam* or *siram*. The only term, with a doubtful exception of *abalā* (770<sup>a</sup>), to which a technical significance could be attached is *visattikam*.<sup>1</sup> It occurs 8 times in *Sn.* viz. *Sn.* 333<sup>c</sup>, 768<sup>c</sup>, 857<sup>d</sup>, 1053<sup>d</sup>=1054<sup>d</sup>=1067<sup>d</sup>=1085<sup>d</sup>=1087<sup>d</sup>. Where the evolution of the idea is concerned this line appears the oldest of them all, for its use here is non-technical.

Sn. 769; The collective *dvandva* cpds. are old. The word *porisam* belongs to an old stratum (v. I. *parisam*, cp. Sk. *paurusam*). It appears as a collective neuter. The contracted form *thiyo* is historical; and the word *puthū* is met with in the old language (cp. *Jātaka* verse).

Sn. 770; According to the Comy. the word *abalā* is technical (*tanhā*), but its use in any technical sense elsewhere is not met with. The phrase *abalā va nam balīyanti* could best be translated as, "being weak themselves (i.e. *kāmā*) they overpower him" (cp. Chalmers' translation). A similar phrase is seen at J. IV, 84 (verse), *vātā balīyanti* (cp. *Pv.* II, 61). Line c, cp. *Dh.* 1, *Th*1, 735. The simile of the ship is continued in 771<sup>d</sup>. The v. I. *silvā* may be compared with *Dh.* 369 ( $\sqrt{\text{śri}}$ ? to depend on). All these instances show that the language of the *Kāma Sutta* is necessarily very old.

The metre of the poem is different from that of many other parts of the *vagga* (including the four *Aṭṭhakas*). It is in the Śloka metre like Nos. 7, 10, 15 and part of 16, i.e. (*Sn.* 814-823, 848-861, 935-954, 955-962). The majority of the *suttas* is in *tristubh* viz. Nos. 2-5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, and part of 16 of the *vagga* (i.e. *Sn.* 772-779, 780-787, 788-795, 796-803, 824-833, 835-847, 862-877, 878-894, 895-914, 963-975). The *Jarā Sutta* (*Sn.* 804-813) and *Sn.* 834 are in *Vaitālīya*. It has been emphasised earlier that metre is no safe guide to the date of a poem in Pāli, for, not all *tristubhs* in Pāli date back to a pre-Śloka period. The lack of uniformity in metre in the whole *vagga* and the fact that essentially most of its *suttas* are linguistically old lead to the hypothesis that it was formed from already existing older material. The *Kāma Sutta* is one such instance, and the only conclusion that could be drawn (from the analogy of the *Ratana Sutta*) is that it was one of the last *suttas* to enter the *vagga*. On this account it cannot be proved late, for it may have had an independent existence prior to its introduction here which itself had taken place at a very early date.

The theme of this *sutta* is a very popular one in Pāli. Instances where monks and laymen are advised to give up *kāma* are too numerous and therefore need not be mentioned here. Although there are many passages in the Canon dwelling on this topic, there is hardly any section which

1. cp. Ardhamāgadhī (Jaina) *visottiya*=Sk *visrotasika*.

bears a resemblance to this *sutta*. J. IV, 167-172 contains a set of 9 *gāthās* of which the first is identical with the first *gāthā* here, but the other 8 are different—though in tone and theme they are similar. Again *DhA.* III, 284 commenting on *Dh.* 216,<sup>2</sup> contains a passage similar to this *sutta* but the words and the tone are quite different. (Also *vide* PTS s.v. *kāma*). The other instances where *gāthās* of this *sutta* are found repeated are either quotations or examples for commenting viz. *Sn.* 766-768 are commented at *Nett.* 69, *Sn.* 766<sup>ab</sup> quoted at *PsA.* 50, *Vism.* 378; *Sn.* 767-771 commented at *Nett.* 6; *Sn.* 767 quoted at *SA.* I, 32, *Vism.* 576; and *Sn.* 769 quoted at *UdA.* 120. *Sn.* 768 is common with *ThI*, 457, 769<sup>ab</sup> with J.IV, 240, 771<sup>d</sup> with *Dh.* 123, J. IV, 173, and 771<sup>b</sup> with *Dh.* 369. The lines and *pādas* that are common to *Sn.* and other works cannot be established as borrowings.

## 69

## The Aṭṭhakas

The four *suttas* following the *Kāma Sutta* consist of eight stanzas each and hence are called *Aṭṭhakas* in Pāli. It has already been shown that this fact has led Pāli compilers to designate these *suttas* by this name and take a further step to extend the name to the whole *vagga*. The theme of the first of these “octaves” is closely related to that of the *Kāma Sutta*. In fact the *Guhaṭṭhaka Sutta* appears as a continuation of it and deals with the same question more comprehensively on a psycho ethical basis. The psychological concepts such as *guhā* and *mohana* (*Sn.* 772) are common to other schools of contemporary Indian thought. The term *satto* has a special significance, i.e. attached to the *guhā*. The psychological basis of this *sutta* is further seen in terms like *mamāyita*, *amama* (*Sn.* 777) *ubhosu antesu* (778), *diṭṭhasutesu* (778), and *saññaṃ* (779). As parallelisms with the previous *sutta* *Sn.* 779<sup>a</sup> may be compared with *Sn.* 771,<sup>c</sup> *parigga-hesu* (779<sup>b</sup>) with *Sn.* 769, and *Sn.* 779<sup>c</sup> with *Sn.* 770 while *appamatta* may be said to refer to the yogic ideal.

On account of the similarity of the themes of the *Kāma* and *Guhaṭṭhaka Suttas* it may be argued that the *Kāma Sutta* was placed in front of the *Guhaṭṭhaka* aiming at an arrangement in accordance with subject matter. This, however, has not met with much success, for *suttas* 6 and 7 of this *vagga* bear an appreciable resemblance to *suttas* 1 and 2 in this respect. If these two were placed immediately after the *Guhaṭṭhaka* the four *Aṭṭhakas* would not have remained as a group. In the same way the

2. *Taṇhāya jāyatī soko, taṇhāya jāyatī bhayaṃ,*  
*taṇhāya vippamuttassa natthi soko kuto bhayaṃ.*



subject matter of *suttas* 3, 4 and 5 resembles that of 8, 12, 13 and the discourse in 9. Instead of these *suttas* following one after the other they occur in three separate groups showing on the one hand the incompleteness of the classification, and the partial adherence to a method of arrangement according to external form, on the other.

The three *suttas* following *Guhathhaka* deal with the various aspects of one and the same theme. They indicate the Buddha's attitude to philosophical speculation. The *Dutthathhaka* points out the position of a *muni* who is beyond all censure and has become steadfast by casting off ( $\sqrt{dhu}$ ) all philosophical views (*ditthi*). The *Suddhatthaka* ridicules the notion of attaining purity (*suddhi*) through metaphysical speculation and emphasises the importance of remaining aloof from biases and limitations. The *Paramatthaka* declares that philosophical disputation should be given up and that a true and steadfast sage needs no philosophical views to lean on.

In all these *suttas*, as well as in Nos. 8, 9, 12 and 13 and numerous other old *suttas* of the Canon the futility of metaphysical speculation is emphasised. The Buddha's attitude towards the subject is made evident in them. From a historical examination of the dominant ideas in them it could be inferred that they represent a very early stratum in Buddhist thought. The excessive indulgence in metaphysical subtleties of later Buddhism, specially that of Mahāyānic schools affords a clear contrast to the ideas and sentiments of these *suttas*. The main theme is the relinquishment of philosophical dogmas but other references to fundamental tenets of early Buddhism (e.g. *Sn.* 790<sup>c</sup>, 792<sup>cd</sup>, 793<sup>a</sup>, 794<sup>cd</sup>, 800<sup>c</sup>, 801<sup>ab</sup>, 803<sup>ab</sup>, etc.) are clearly indicative of the spirit of early Buddhism that these *suttas* breathe. Disputation is condemned. It is not a knowledge of metaphysics that is sought after, but a life of selfless wandering free from attachments to the states of being (777<sup>cd</sup>) and unmeasured by sense-impressions (778<sup>d</sup>). The essentials on which early emphasis lay are summarised in *Sn.* 779. The *muni* is not sullied by "graspings" (*pariggaha*), he crosses the "flood" by the realisation of *saññā* (*SnA.* 518 *nāmarūpa*), has uprooted the dart, wanders diligently and yearns for neither world. Again, the *muni* has no *khila* (stubbornness, *Sn.* 780<sup>c</sup>), he is serene and released and does not proclaim his attainments (783<sup>ab</sup>). He has no theories which he has evolved and fabricated (784<sup>a</sup>) and is not one whose peace is dependent on mutability (784<sup>d</sup>). He is a *dhona* (he who has cast off everything) and is independent in every way (*Sn.* 786). He has reached that state when he has no views either to approve of or disprove any dogmas (*Sn.* 787<sup>c</sup>).<sup>3</sup>

3. *SnA.* 523 comments on *attam nirattam* as: *attaditthi vā ucchedaditthi vā natthi*.



Many of the terms used in this section to describe the *muni* (both epithets and phrases) have a philosophical tone. They are in some instances technical, but the majority of them were yet to develop into technical expressions with definite values. The Commentary attempts to explain *khila* as *rāgādi khila* which shows a definite development of the term by the time of the compilation of *SnA*. (cp. *Sn.* 973<sup>b</sup>, 212<sup>c</sup>, 477<sup>c</sup> 540<sup>d</sup>, 1059<sup>d</sup> and 1147<sup>d</sup>). The only instances where it has a technical significance are *Sn.* 540 and 1147. A gradual process of crystallisation is to be seen in *ussadā* at *Sn.* 783<sup>d</sup>. Its philosophical import is evident in all the occurrences of the term in *Sn.* viz. 515<sup>d</sup>, 855<sup>d</sup>, 624<sup>b</sup> and 920<sup>d</sup>. The usual seven *ussadā* are given at *Nd1*, 72. The term *dhona* in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* is used with reference to the shaking off of *diṭṭhi* (*Sn.* 786<sup>c</sup>, 813<sup>a</sup> and 834<sup>c</sup>); but at *Sn.* 351<sup>b</sup> it is an epithet of the Buddha. *Nd1*, 77 explains it as *paññā* while the Commentator gives the interpretation of his day. The wider application seen usually in Commentaries (viz. *SnA.* 542, J. III, 160) is not to be met with in *Sn.* for it is solely used to signify the abandonment of *diṭṭhi*. Equally abstract and semi-technical in use is the term *upaya* (also *anūpaya*, *Sn.* 787<sup>ab</sup>, 797<sup>c</sup>, 786<sup>d</sup>) but it has not found much in subsequent literature. One of its cpds. *rūpūpaya* occurs at S. III, 53, etc. cp. *SnA.* 522, *tanhādiṭṭhi upayānaṃ dvinnam abhāvena anūpayo. . sam dvinnam bhāvena upaya* cp. *SnA.* 558 *upagantabbatṭhen upayaṃ rūpādisu ekaṃ pi dhammaṃ upeyya*. In both these instances the Commentator interprets from the level of his day, and the context does not justify the inclusion of *taṇha* in *SnA.* and *Nd1.* 82.

The two phrases *kuppa-paṭicca-santiṃ* (*Sn.* 784<sup>d</sup>) and *attaṃ nirattaṃ* are also interesting. The Commentator has seen too deep into the meaning of *kuppa-paṭicca-santi* when after a long comment he explains it as; *tañ ca ānisaṃsaṃ tañ ca kuppatāya ca paṭic asamuppannatāya ca sammutisantatāya ca k.p.s. saṅkhātāṃ diṭṭhiṃ nissito va hoti* (cp. *Nd1*, 74-75). The phrase ‘characterising the peace which is dependent on mutability’ describes the *santi* of him who sees virtues in himself on account of his speculative theories. E. M. Hare translates it as ‘Calm on quaking built’. It is in fact no technical term. The Comy. is again seen giving the interpretation of its day to *attaṃ nirattaṃ* where it speaks of *attadiṭṭhi* and *ncchedadiṭṭhi* (*SnA.* 523 and *Nd1*, 82) taking *atta* to mean *ātman* and *nirattaṃ* the BSk. *nairātmyaṃ* which is a later development. (*attaṃ*—*āttam*). The universe of discourse here is *diṭṭhi* (philosophical views); and hence *attaṃ* and *nirattaṃ* cannot refer to anything else but the acceptance or rejection of *diṭṭhi*. In the light of the subsequent elaboration of the *anatta* doctrine which was a *sine qua non* in the earlier teaching, this word has undergone a complete transformation.



That the term *upadhi* (*sopadhika Sn. 789<sup>c</sup>*) has a definite connotation even in *Sn.* can be seen from the various instances in which it occurs. *Sn. 728* makes it quite clear.<sup>4</sup> Also cp. *Sn. 1050<sup>cd</sup> 1051, 33<sup>c</sup>, 34<sup>c</sup>, 546<sup>a</sup> 572<sup>a</sup>, 364<sup>a</sup>, 33<sup>d</sup>, 34<sup>d</sup>, 642<sup>b</sup> 371<sup>c</sup>, 1057<sup>b</sup>, 1083<sup>b</sup> and 992<sup>f</sup>*. All these occurrences show that the term has undergone a definite crystallisation, and there is no doubt that the concept belonged to the earliest stratum of Buddhist thought.

The phrase, *diṭṭhe sute sīlavate mule vā* (in what is seen and heard, in ascetic practices and holy vows and in what is cognised—*Sn. 790<sup>b</sup>*) is a curious combination of functions of the senses on the one hand and external practices on the other. In this context *diṭṭha*, *suta* and *muta* (*muta* from  $\sqrt{man}$ , I.E. \* $\sqrt{mn}$ ) imply the sights, sounds and other undefined sense impressions respectively which are considered auspicious and pure (cp. *Sn. 790<sup>a</sup> aññato suddhim āha:* and *Nd1, 87II.: SnA. 527 comments, muta ca uppannena micchāñāṇena*). Both *Nd.* and *SnA.* are not clear about *muta*. This idea occurs no less than 20 times in *Sn.* in similar words viz. *Sn. 790<sup>ab</sup> (=797<sup>b</sup>=887<sup>a</sup>), 793<sup>ab</sup>=914<sup>ab</sup> (793<sup>b</sup>=A. II, 25), 798<sup>cd</sup> (c=S. I. 203), 797<sup>ab</sup> (790<sup>b</sup>, 887<sup>a</sup>), 887<sup>ab</sup>, 910<sup>ab</sup>, 1079<sup>bc</sup> (=1080<sup>bc</sup>, 1081<sup>bc</sup>), 1082<sup>cd</sup> (=1083<sup>cd</sup>), 788<sup>b</sup> (=789<sup>a</sup>), 802<sup>ab</sup>, 897<sup>d</sup>, 778<sup>d</sup> (=250<sup>d</sup>).* In all these instances the psychological basis of the reference to sense impressions is hidden by the nature of the context which either introduces or implies *sīlabbata* along with it. It is clear that all these references do not merely speak of the functions of the sense organs which produce the result but mention the result itself. Yet, *Sn. 1086<sup>a</sup> and 1122<sup>cd</sup>* seem to bring out the psychological aspect clearly viz. *idha diṭṭha-suta-muta-viññātesu* (in things that are seen, heard, sensed and perceived), and

*na tuyhaṃ adiṭṭhaṃ asutam-mutaṃ vā  
atho aviññātaṃ kiñcanam atthi loke*

(there is nothing that is not seen, heard or sensed or else not perceived—cognised—by you in this world) as at *D. III, 134, 232, It. 121*. In *Sn. 897*, *diṭṭha* and *suta* the functions of the two primary senses only are mentioned as at *Sn. 778<sup>d</sup>, 250<sup>d</sup>, 1079<sup>b</sup> 1080<sup>b</sup> and 1081<sup>b</sup>*, although they

4. *Upadhīnidānā pabhavanti dukkhā  
ye ke cī lokasmim anekarūpā;  
yo ve avidvā upadhiṃ karoti  
punappunam dukkham upeti mando;  
tasmā pajānam upadhiṃ na kayirā  
dukkhassa jātippabhavānupassī.*

(Those diverse forms of sorrow which prevail in the world arise basing their origin on the material substratum. Indeed, the indolent fool who nurtures his material substratum repeatedly brings himself to sorrow. Therefore should he who discerns and comprehends the origin of the arising of sorrow not accumulate his substratum).

are intrinsically connected with *sīlabbata*. The same idea is expressed at *Sn.* 839<sup>a</sup> and 1078<sup>a</sup> as well as *Sn.* 840<sup>ab</sup>//839<sup>ab</sup>. Although these references are similar to each other in meaning, *diṭṭha* and *suta* (and *muta*) in combination with *sīlavatāni* mentioned or implied, are essentially different from *diṭṭha-suta-muta-viññāta* in their fundamentals. The latter has a more universal application and is primarily meant to describe the functions of the senses (*muta* representing those of the three senses not mentioned under sight and sound, and *viññāta* that of *manas*).

The early Buddhist emphasis on the detachment from both *puñña* and *pāpa* is seen at *Sn.* 790<sup>c</sup>. It is aptly described as *attañjaho* in line *d* i.e. abandoning whatever is “grasped” (*ātta* cp. 800<sup>a</sup>, 787<sup>c</sup> not as at *Nd1*, 90 *attadiṭṭhijaho* nor *SnA.* 527 *attadiṭṭhiyā yassakassaci vā gahaṇassa pahīṇattā attañjaho*, both of which being interpretations of a later level). The idea of “crossing over” which is so frequent in the early Pāli literature (*oghaṃ* √ *tṛ* or *pāraṃ* √ *gam*; vide the introduction to the *Pārāyana*, PBR, 1, 3, p. 146, is found here as at *Dh.* 412, 370, *Th1*, 633, *Sn.* 212, 473, etc. in its special reference to *saṅgam* (attachment). A *saññasatto* (*Sn.* 792) is one who is led by his senses; lit. “attached to percepts”. Both *SnA.* 527 and *Nd1.* 93 speak of him as the opposite of *vidvā*. The idea of a *sīmātiga brāhmaṇa* is common to all stages of Buddhism cp. also *tādi*, etc.

A comparison and analysis of all these ideas shows that they belong to the earliest strata of Buddhism. As pointed out earlier, some of them are in an early stage of development while others have undergone a certain degree of crystallisation. It is also noteworthy that some of these concepts as *upayo* which have not undergone any development here are scarcely found in later works or other works which may claim equal antiquity with *Sn.* On the other hand, elaborate theories and extensive treatises are to be found in later literature with regard to the more important of these concepts which developed fully under favourable conditions. A mere study of the ideology of these *Aṭṭhakas* and a careful examination of where the emphasis is laid in the poems reveal their very antiquity.

*Linguistic data* which form a very important factor for the determination of the age of the ballads confirms what has been arrived at by means of other criteria. In fact, in the case of these poems, linguistic data conclusively establish their antiquity. It is very significant that all the old forms in these *suttas* point to some Vedic dialect of Pāli rather than to the standard canonical Pāli. The language in general reflects a form of early Pāli. It is not proposed to examine every stanza individually. However, a brief survey will make the position clear. In this short section of 32 stanzas there are four full Vedic double forms with a dialectical (perhaps



Māgadhī) influence viz. *cutāse* Sn. 774<sup>d</sup>, *avītatanhāse* 776<sup>d</sup>, *sitāse* 791<sup>a</sup>, and *paṭicchitāse* 803<sup>b</sup>. There are 9 ppr. forms ending in *-aṃ* and *-āna* viz. *tiṭṭhaṃ* 772<sup>b</sup>, *jappaṃ* 773<sup>d</sup>, *caraṃ* 779<sup>c</sup>, *abhijānaṃ* 788<sup>c</sup>, *vaḍānaṃ* 789<sup>d</sup>, *pamuñcaṃ* 791<sup>d</sup>, *paribbasāno* 796<sup>a</sup>, *anupādiyāno* 800<sup>a</sup>, and *anādiyānaṃ* 802<sup>c</sup>. There are some words which are restricted to the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* only e.g. *paribbasāno* at Sn. 796, 878, 880, and 895, three of which occur at the beginning of a *sutta* (i.e. except 880). There are archaic verbal forms as *jaññā* Sn. 775<sup>b</sup>, *pāvā* 782<sup>bd</sup>, and *pāva* 789<sup>d</sup>. The middle base *kubba*-is preferred to *kar-*; *kubba* occurs at Sn. 777<sup>d</sup>, 778<sup>c</sup>, 781<sup>c</sup>, 790<sup>d</sup>, and 794<sup>d</sup>; *kur-at* 796<sup>b</sup> and *kar-at* 800<sup>b</sup> and in *purekkharonti* at 803<sup>a</sup>, 794<sup>a</sup> and *purakkhata* 784<sup>b</sup>. There are a few other unusual verbal or secondary forms as *suppahāyā* 772<sup>d</sup>, *duppamuñcā*, *aññamokkhā* 773<sup>b</sup>, *avadāniyā* 774<sup>b</sup>, *pariññā*, *accaycyā* 781<sup>a</sup>, *svātivattā* 785<sup>a</sup>, *niccheyya* 785<sup>b</sup>, 801<sup>d</sup>, *vikappayeyya* 793<sup>d</sup>, 802<sup>d</sup>, *nissayeyya* 798<sup>d</sup>, *kappayeyya* 799<sup>a</sup> and *anūpaneyya* 799<sup>c</sup>. There are also two medial optative 3 sg. forms, *sikkhetha* 775<sup>a</sup>, and *maññetha* 799<sup>d</sup> which are characteristically *gāthā* forms.

The syntax too points to an old idiom. There are at least 10 instances of the construction with the historical locative of relation in varying shades of meaning viz. at Sn. 772<sup>a</sup>, 774<sup>a</sup>, 776<sup>cd</sup>, 777<sup>d</sup>, 779<sup>b</sup>, 783<sup>b</sup>, 785<sup>bc</sup>, 786<sup>b</sup>, 787<sup>a</sup>, and 793<sup>a</sup>. All these are sufficient data to prove the antiquity of this section of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*.

## 70

## Jarā Sutta

This *sutta* consists of 10 stanzas in *vaitālīya* metre. The only other *vaitālīya* verse in the *vagga* is Sn. 834. The theme of the poem is the transiency and impermanence of life. One is advised to leave the household life “seeing that no worldly possessions are eternal and that everything is in a state of flux”. Emulating the sages—*munayo* Sn. 809—the wise man is exhorted not to form any egoistic attachment to anything conceived as “one’s own” since everything is left behind at death—Sn. 806. Death leaves behind only the memory of the dead.

The above ideas in Sn. 804-809 closely conform to the title of the *sutta*. Although the last four stanzas—Sn. 810-813—appear somewhat foreign to the *sutta* under its present title, all of them except the last stanza are connected with Sn. 809; and they fit in with the general theme on account of the similarity of ideas. Sn. 810<sup>d</sup> is the logical extension of 805<sup>d</sup>, and similarly 811<sup>c</sup> is closely associated with 809<sup>a</sup>. The sage is called a *dhona* in the concluding stanza; and in this respect 813<sup>a</sup> may be compared

with 786<sup>ab</sup>, line *c* with 824<sup>b</sup> and the whole stanza with 790, 793-795, 914, etc. The line *d*, *na hi so rajjati no virajjati*, breathes the same air as the concluding lines of the *Suddhaṭṭhaka*,

*na rāgarāgī na virāgarātto  
tassīdha n'atthi param uggahītaṃ.*

The uniformity of *metre* suggests that the poem as a whole dates back to the same period. The theme of the poem which is in praise of the *muni*-ideal is common with other poems of great antiquity in *Sn*. Sufficient has been said already on this topic and it not proposed to discuss it here.

The *language* of the *sutta* calls for particular attention. In discussing the stanzas individually any striking points in ideology and doctrine will be pointed out. *Sn*. 804 the ablative in *oraṃ vassasatā* represents the old idiom. *miyyati* (lines *bd*)=impersonal medial cp. *Sk. mriyate*. An absolutive in adverbial function is seen in *aticca* (l.c); cp. *upādāya gacchati*, *samādāya rakkhati*, etc. The form *jarasā* can be explained in two ways; 1. inst. sg. of a noun *jaras*, an extension of the *-as* declension (besides *jarā* f. and *jara* m. or n.); 2. *-sā* adverbial suffix from the analogy of the adverbial inst. of *-as* nouns. The whole stanza is rather elliptical. Grassmann, *Wörterbuch zum Rgveda*, points out 6 examples from the Vedas where *jara* (*s*) is masc. cp. also the inst. at *Rv*. X. 85. Thus this is an old form in *Sn*. going back to a Vedic dialect. *Sn*. 805 cp. *Mbh*. XII, 805 and *Aṣṭa Prajñā Fāramitā* 254. I. *a*, cp. 777<sup>a</sup>, 809<sup>b</sup>. Of the 17 occurrences of *mamāyati* or its verbal derivatives, as many as 9 are found in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*. *Mamāyita* is clearly the earlier word signifying egoism. The word *atta* is not so frequently used in this sense in *Sn*. The opposite idea *amama* occurs 5 times in *Sn*. whereas *anatta* occurs only twice viz. *anattani* (756<sup>a</sup>) and *anattagarahī* (913<sup>d</sup>). Of these two instances only *anattani* (756<sup>a</sup>) has some connection with *amama*, but as this occurs in the relatively late *Dvayatānupassanā Sutta* it may be surmised that *amama* stood for *anatta* and *mamatta* for the parallel idea *atta* or *attadiṭṭhi*. The evidence at hand is insufficient to establish whether this really was the germ of the more comprehensive *anatta* theory of Buddhism. Another word which is in popular use in this *vagga* is *pariggahā* (five out of the seven occurrences in *Sn*. are in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*—viz. 393<sup>c</sup>, 470<sup>b</sup>, 809<sup>c</sup>, 805<sup>b</sup>, 871<sup>b</sup>, 872<sup>b</sup>, and 779<sup>b</sup>). The use of this word is necessitated by the subject matter, and it is semi-technical. It is evident that the central theme is the transiency of life and the impermanence of worldly possessions. The title *Amama Sutta* or *Anagāriya Sutta* would equally fit the poem, for specially the last few stanzas emphasise this aspect. The cpd. in l.c appears to be



an expression of popular origin. *Sn.* 807<sup>a</sup> *supinena* (with *samprasāraṇa* and *svarabhakti*). The consonant group *sva*-more frequently undergoes *samprasāraṇa* than assimilation in *Sn.* There are six instances of *samprasāraṇa* (viz. *supati* 110<sup>c</sup>, *supitena* 331<sup>b</sup>, *supina* 293<sup>d</sup>, 360<sup>b</sup>, 807<sup>a</sup>, and 927<sup>a</sup>) as contrasted with one instance of assimilation (*soṇā* 675<sup>c</sup>) and one instance of *svarabhakti* and consonantal hardening (*supāṇā* 201<sup>a</sup>). Metrical exigencies may have promoted this tendency, but the scarcity of assimilated forms may be significant as pointing to a particular dialect. I.c. *piyāyitaṃ* cp. *mamāyitaṃ*. *Sn.* 808<sup>d</sup>: *akkheyyaṃ* has the appearance of a deliberate pun (i.e. from *ā+√khyā* or *a+√kṣi*). *SnA*, 543 comments, *Nāmamattaṃ eva tu avasissati*. (The mere name remains); *Nd* 1, 127, *Rūpagataṃ, vedanāgataṃ, saññāgataṃ, saṅkhāragataṃ, viññāṇagataṃ pahīyati. . nāmaṃ evāvasissati. Akkheyyanti akkhātum, kathitum, bhaṇitum, dīpayitum, voharituntī, nāmaṃ evāvasissati akkheyyaṃ*. (All that pertains to the fivefold aggregates perishes. . only the name remains. *Akkheyyaṃ* means to name, to speak, to address, to elucidate and to employ in usage; and only the name remains to be spoken of (or understood). Also vide PTS s.v. *ā+√khyā*. It is quite probable that this is a gerund from *a+√kṣi* (vide Pāṇinī, VI, 1, 81), i.e. *kṣayya>kheyya*, cp. *śayyā>seyyā*. The *Bṛhadārayaka* has the same idea (*Bṛh.* III, 2, 12), *Yājñavalkyeti hovāca, yatrāyaṃ puruṣo mriyate, kim enaṃ na jahātī ti, nāmety anantaṃ nāma* (Yājñavalkya said: when a man dies what is it that he does not give up?—It is the name for it is everlasting). Also cp. *Maitri Upaniṣad* II, 4, 6, 28 *ananto' kṣayyah* (endless and imperishable) which seem to suggest that Pāli *akkheyya* may be from *a+√kṣi*.

The *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* contains 9 out of the 11 references to the word *jantu* in *Sn.* The parallel word which is more frequently used in Pāli is *satta*<sup>5</sup> (10 times in *Sn.*) and *jantu* has almost gone out of use in later Pāli (s.v., PTS). It is only in one doubtful instance that *satta* (as referring to creature, being) occurs in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* i.e. *satto guhāyaṃ bahunābhicchanno*—*Sn.* 772<sup>a</sup> (from *√srj*?).

*Sn.* 810. In line *a* is found one of the numerous instances where the word *bhikkhu* is used in the same connotation as *muni*. The word *bhavana* in line *d* is apparently a synonym for *bhava*. It occurs again at *Sn.* 685<sup>b</sup>, 937<sup>c</sup> and once in prose. *Sn.* 811, 812: The points of interest in these two stanzas are the similes in 811<sup>d</sup> and 812<sup>ab</sup>, which are in fact the same simile stated in different words. Along with 812b may be cited,

---

5. cp. *Raṭṭhapāla Sutta* (M.II. IV, 2): *satto pana gacchati yena kāmmam* where *satta=jantu*.

*padumam va toyena alippamānam* (Sn. 71<sup>c</sup> cp. 213<sup>e</sup>),  
*nopalippati toyena, toyena padumam yathā* (Th1, 701<sup>ed</sup>),  
*puṇḍarīkam yathā vagga toyē na upalippati* (Sn. 517<sup>ab</sup>),  
*puṇḍarīkam va toyena saṅkhāre nopalippati* (Th1, 1180<sup>ab</sup>):

and with Sn. 711<sup>a</sup> and 812<sup>a</sup> the following:

*vāri pokkharapatte va* (Dh. 401, It. 84, Sn. 625),  
*udabindu va pokkhare* (Th1, 665<sup>b</sup>),  
*bhikkhu yathā pokkhare vāribindu* (Sn. 392<sup>d</sup>),  
*udabindu va pokkharā* (Dh. 336<sup>d</sup> Th1, 401<sup>d</sup>) and  
*vāribindu va* (M. III, 300, J.VI, 595).

Sn. 811<sup>ab</sup> is significant as showing the detachment of a *muni* (cp. 813<sup>d</sup> already discussed).

The general tone of the *Jarā Sutta* is archaic. It definitely represents the old *gāthā*-language. The thought in the *sutta* like that in many other old pieces is representative of the times. The *Salla Sutta* may be cited as a close parallel to this poem in ideology. The only difference is that it deals primarily with death while *amama* is emphasised in the *Jarā Sutta*. All the available internal evidence is in support of its early composition, and it is quite probable that it is as old as the four *Aṭṭhakas*.

## 71

### Māgandiya Sutta

The *Māgandiya Sutta* is a dialogue of 13 stanzas in *triṣṭubh* metre. The context of the *sutta* is the occasion of Māgandiya's futile effort to give his daughter away in marriage to the Buddha. The story is narrated in detail at SnA. 542-544. There is also a dialogue between the Brahmin Mākandika and the Buddha at Divy. 519-520 which is incorporated in a prose and verse mixed narrative (Divy. 515-521). The two narratives at Divy. and SnA. agree in general, but differ in details. In the Pāli Commentary the Buddha foresees the good fortune of the *brahmin* Māgandiya and his wife to attain *arahatship* (*arahatta phatupanissaya*) and contrives to meet the brahmin. In Divy. it is a chance meeting. The names of Mākandika's wife and daughter are given as Sākati and Anupamā respectively in Divy., but the Pāli gives only the feminine of the family name as Māgandiyā. Divy. contains a full description of the conversation between the brahmin and his wife about their future son-in-law, and introduces a new character, an old man who eagerly offers to marry Anupamā when the Buddha refuses her hand. Mākandika refuses his offer and he vomits hot blood and dies. It states nothing further of the



Mākandikas while the Pāli mentions the attainment of *arahatship* of both husband and wife (*SnA*. 518).

The dialogue at *Divy.* 519-520 which consists of 5 stanzas shows some resemblance to a few corresponding stanzas in *Sn.* viz. st. 1 roughly corresponds to *Sn.* 835, st. 2 has some bearing on *Sn.* 836, and stanzas 4 and 5 together are somewhat parallel to *Sn.* 845. The ideas in st. 4<sup>ab</sup> are similar to those at *Sn.* 845<sup>ab</sup>, though they are not identical. The simile at stt. 4<sup>cd</sup> and 5<sup>ab</sup> is the same as at *Sn.* 845<sup>cd</sup>. The idea expressed at *Sn.* 845<sup>cf</sup> is found at st. 5<sup>cd</sup>. The only difference between them is that in *Divy.* these two stanzas are uttered by the Buddha about himself, whereas in *Sn.* it is the *muni* who is described.

Again, *Sn.* 835 speaks of the three daughters of Māra as actual persons and not as mere personifications of ideas in an allegorical representation as at *Sn.* 436 (*Padhāna Sutta*) where *arati* and *taṇhā* are mentioned as the second and fourth *senās* of Māra. *Ragā* is to be identified with *kāmā* in *Sn.* 436. In the *Māgandiya Sutta* the three daughters of Māra are actual persons. In the *Divyāvadāna* their names are not mentioned, and the stanza runs,

*drṣṭā mayā Mārasutā hi vipra, tṛṣṇā Na me nā'pi tathā ratiśca*  
*chando na me kāmaguṇeṣu kaśchit, tasmād imāṃ mūtrapurīṣa pūrṇāṃ.*

Although the daughters are alluded to, *taṇhā* (*tṛṣṇā*) and *rati* are qualities mentioned along with *kāmaguṇeṣu chandas* (cp. *methunasmiṃ chando*). Judging from this it is very difficult to state definitely which version preserves the older tradition. In both cases the personification seems to have been long forgotten and Māra is conceived as an actual being who had three daughters.

Judging from the abruptness of the change of topic and the transition from one subject to another in *Sn.* 836<sup>cd</sup> it may be argued that *Sn.* 835, 836 are versifications of an old prose introduction. It is also a plausible explanation that the basis of the *sutta* is the Buddha's encounter with Māgandiya. This is common to both versions, and without falling into the error of presuming that the BSk. version is older than the Pāli, on account of its brevity, a common source may be assigned to both. From the evidence of *Divy.* any suggestion that the two opening stanzas were foreign to the *sutta* is untenable. Moreover, there is no difference in metre and language between *Sn.* 835, and 836 and the rest of the poem, and by no means are these two stanzas an interpolation of a compiler.

Yet, a closer comparison of the two versions shows that the main theme of the Pāli poem is not found in BSk. The *Māgandiya Sutta* praises

the *muni* who does not enter into disputes and has inward peace whereas the central topic in BSk. is Mākandika's quest for a son-in-law. The first three stanzas deal directly with it and the last two are given as the Buddha's own words of self-praise. These stanzas lack the detached and impersonal refined note struck in the stanzas of the Pāli in which the Buddha praises the *muni* when invited to speak about himself (*Sn.* 836<sup>cd</sup>). It is evident that *Sn.* 837-847 can stand as an independent *sutta* without the two opening stanzas (*Sn.* 835-836). This leads to the inference that probably the Pāli *sutta* represents a fusion of two independent ballads of which *Divy.* 515-520 forms only one component, affording a parallel to *Sn.* 835-836.

## PUCCHĀS OF THE PĀRĀYANA VAGGA

72

### Ajitamānavaka-Pucchā

The *Vatthugāthā* and Commentarial literature state that Ajita was a disciple of the brahmin Bāvarī, although according to *AA.* I, 184 he was Bāvarī's nephew. *Theragāthā* (*Th*1, 20) mentions an Elder Ajita who had, in a former birth, offered a *kapittha* fruit to the Buddha Vipassī. The Commentary on this stanza (*Th*1 A. I, 78) refers to him as the son of the assessor (*agghāpaniya*) of the King of Kosala. *Apadāna* No. 509 (*Ap.* II, 449) also speaks of a Kapitthaphaladāyaka Thera (cp. *Th* 1, 20), but there is another *Apadāna* of Ajita the pupil of Bāvarī (No. 397-*Ap.* I, 335). There is no attempt made in the Commentaries to identify Ajita, the Kapitthaphaladāyaka with Ajita of the *Pārāyana*. The subsequent growth of the Bāvarī-episode in connection with the *Pārāyana* (*PBR.* 1, 3, p. 146), the antiquity of the *Pārāyana* itself (*ibid*), and the vagueness with which some Commentators refer to it,<sup>6</sup> are additional testimony to the fact that the Ajita of the *Pucchā* and the Ajita of *Th*1, 20 (cp. *Ap.* II, 449) are two different persons. The *Vatthu-gāthās* refer to the sixteen questioners as, *sissā soḷasa brāhmaṇā*. The name Ajita need not necessarily be that of a brahmin (*a-jī-ta*=unconquered); and it suits a *kṣatriya* equally well. It is significant that these sixteen are spoken of as *āyasmā Ajito*, *āyasmā Puṇṇako* etc. in the *pucchās*. They address the Buddha on equal terms as *mārīsa* as do all *kṣatriyas* and the warrior gods of the Hindus (Sakka,

6. *AA.* IV, 35: *Addhateyyagāthāsataparimāṇaṃ Pārāyanāsuttam* (P. *Sutta* which consists of 250 stanzas); but the entire vagga with its Prologue and Epilogue contains only 274 stanzas, *pucchās* alone being 92 stanzas. The *Pārāyana* is called a *sutta* here. Nd2 also refers to some *pucchās* as *suttas* and *pañhas*.



etc.). It is only in the titles of the *pucchās* that they are called *māṇavā* (the text of the prologue and the epilogue is of no consequence for obvious reasons). The word *māṇavā*, which often designates a young brahmin is no conclusive proof of these men being brahmins. Some of the names are decidedly *kṣatriya*; e.g. Ajita Bhadrāvudha, the names Nanda and Hemaka are doubtful, and Piṅgiya and Mogharāja are most probably nicknames of *kṣatriya* origin. Neumann (*Reden* 546) sees in the name Bāvarī a representative of the famous Kātyāyana school of the White *Yajurveda* (Bādarī). He says that among the *māṇavas* there are seven other *Yajurveda* priests of whom four belong to the White *Yajurveda*. He also mentions a still older Bādarī of the Black *Yajurveda* to whom reference is made in the *Baudhāyana-gr̥hyasūtra* (I, 7). Even if his suggestion is accepted there are still nine others who have to be proven brahmins. Moreover, a name like Dhotaka, which Neumann had in mind (his seven *Yajurveda* priests are not enumerated) is a fitting name for a disciple of the Buddha (√*dhu*, *dhunāti*, to shake off, to purge, etc. cp. the concept *dhona* which is often used as an epithet of the *muni* in *Sn.*). Likewise Mettagu, Upasīva, Ajita and Tissametteyya<sup>7</sup> are very suitable names for the Buddha's disciples.

The first question asked by Ajita is very far-reaching.<sup>8</sup> On the one hand it could be interpreted empirically to mean only the external objects of the world, on the other it implies Ajita's premonition of world-sorrow. The Buddha in his reply alludes to the First Truth: *dukkham assa mahabbhayam*. In his next question Ajita goes a step beyond the answer and anticipates further. This clearly shows that Buddha's interlocutor was a person with a considerable previous metaphysical training. The second question is asked in a fashion that makes it possible to illustrate indirectly the Four Noble Truths. Because Ajita himself has some idea of the misery inherent in the world he is eager to know by what means it could be checked. Following the Buddha's reply (*Sn.* 1035) he shows his desire to know how *sati*, *paññā* and the individual *nāmarūpa* cease to exist. Here the question hints at *nirodha* (or perhaps *upekkhā* as well), and in the reply the very word *nirodha* is used. That Ajita thinks clearly ahead and anticipates the replies is evident from his question in *Sn.* 1036.

These questions are far too brilliant to be those of an insignificant disciple of a brahmin from the less-known and least-brahmanised zone of the Dakkhi-nāpatha which even during the time of the compilation of

7. There is another Tissametteyya in *Aṭṭhakavagga* 7.

8. Ajitapucchā is commented at *Netti*, pp. 70-72, under *Sodhanāhāra* *Netti*, III. 13. It states that Buddha's replies were in the form of *sodhanā* and not *ārambha* (on his own initiative) viz...*ti pañhe...ti Bhagavā padam sodheti no ca ārambham*. Ajitapucchā is again commented at great length at *Netti*, 10-21.

the *Baudhāya-nagrhyasūtra* was considered unfit for brahmins (*Baudh.* V, 15). Further, the trend of thought in these questions compares rather closely with the monistic principles of the *Upaniṣads*. The macrocosmic Brahman, identified with Ātman, the world-soul, gives place to the microcosmic Ātman which again is identified with the macrocosm. Though no such philosophical subtleties are in evidence here the progress from world-sorrow to *nāmarūpa* is reminiscent of the *Upaniṣads*. The picture of Ajita in the *pucchā* is not that of a typical brahmin youth but that of a mendicant initiated into the Upaniṣadic way of thinking. One would not be far wrong to conjecture that since the *kṣatriya* seers were the custodians of Upaniṣadic lore and as Ajita's mode of thinking resembles their's that he was a *kṣatriya* belonging to an Upaniṣadic school. The very fact that his name sounds like that of a *kṣatriya* or of a sage, 'The Unconquered', is no conclusive proof of his *kṣatriya* origin.

### Linguistic and other Internal Evidence

The *sutta* generally bears the appearance of an old piece. There is a preponderance of the use of the particle *sū* (or *ssu*) as an emphatic interrogative. This is a general characteristic of many old dialogue-ballads in which the interlocutor continually asks questions. Among forms which may be assigned to a dialectical stratum are; *jappā* (*Sn.* 1033c) which is not confined to *gāthā* and *mārisa* (1038d) found equally well in prose. A double Vedic form with the Māgadhī ending is to be seen at *Sn.* 1038a, *saṅkhatadhammāse*. The sandhi *ki'ssa* (1032c) is probably dialectical viz. *kiṃ assa* > *ki assa* (nasalised *ī*) > *kī'ssa* > *ki'ssa* cp. *Pv.* III, 5, 6. *ki'ssa vatam kiṃ pana brahmacariyam* where *ki* perhaps contains an original nasalised vowel. In both these instances *kī'ssa* cannot be identified with the interrogative pronoun *kissa* in the oft-repeated formula *taṃ kissa hetu*. Also cp. *Pv.* II, 6, 1, *Uṭṭhehi Kaṇhe kī sesi*; the corresponding passage to it at *J.* IV, 79 reads as *kiṃ sesi*.

The other peculiarities are more of a purely grammatical nature, yet pointing to an old stratum of Pāli; e.g. short abl. singulars *vevicchā*, and *pamādā* (*Sn.* 1033b), *pithiyyare* (1034d, 1035d) of Vedic origin (cp. Geiger § 122) with consonantal hardening.

The term *sota* (1034, 1035) is used in the sense of defilements such as *taṇhā* (*SnA.* 586). Of similar application is *sota* at *Sn.* 355

*Acchecchi taṇham idha nāmarūpe (ti Bhagavā)*  
*Kaṇhassa sotam digharattānusayitam*

(He has completely cut off the desire for name-and-form—individual existence—here, the stream of *Kaṇha* which had remained for long). Existence



is often spoken of as a stream; e.g. *bhavasota* at *Sn.* 736b, S.I, 15, IV, 128, etc. It is considered a positive attainment to rid one's self of this *sota*; e.g. *chinnasota* *Sn.* 715b, and also *sotam chindati* M.I, 226. The flux of mind is also a stream, *viññāṇasota* D. III, 105, etc.; and the Noble Eight-fold Path is called a stream (*sota*) at S.V. 347. The terminology of Ajita is allied to Buddhist terminology though at first sight the term appears to be used in a connotation different from that in Buddhism.

Style calls for no attention. The *pucchā* is in śloka metre (*anuṣṭubh*), and metrical irregularities are few viz. an *even* quarter at 1037<sup>a</sup>, a short *pāda* at 1036<sup>a</sup>, and extra-syllabic *pādas* at 1033<sup>ab</sup>.

## 73

## The Other Pucchās

Like Ajita, the other 15 *māṇavās* too have questions to ask the Buddha. Tissametteyya wishes to know of the *mahāpurisa* who is unperturbed and perfectly contented. Puṇṇaka asks the Buddha about the efficacy of sacrifice and the reasons why men offer sacrifices. The Buddha replies that it is all futile and that it would not enable one to overcome birth and decay. Then he expresses his desire to know of them who have transcended birth and decay. Mettagu asks the Buddha the reason for the existence of suffering in this world and the method by which the wise cross the stream of birth, decay, sorrow and lamentation. Dhotaka invites the Buddha to preach to him to enable him to train himself for his release and remove all his doubts. Upasīva requests the Buddha to give him an *ārammana* (means, object) by which he may cross the Flood (*ogha*). Nanda asks whether it is knowledge or the mode of living that characterises a *muni*. He also wishes to find out whether those who profess metaphysical theories have overcome birth and decay. Hemaka tells the Buddha that he took no delight in the theories of the Vitaṇḍavādins, and requests him to preach to him the *dhamma* by which he may transcend 'this sinful bent'. Todeyya asks the Buddha about the nature of the emancipation of him who has no craving, is free from lust, and has overcome doubt. Kappa asks him of the island-refuge from the formidable stream confronting the mortal subject to decay and death. Jatukaṇṇi requests the Buddha to tell him of the *santipada* and to preach to him the *dhamma* to help him to leave behind birth and decay. Bhadrāvudha praises the Buddha and requests him to preach the *dhamma* to all. Udaya wishes the Buddha to declare to him the deliverance by transcendental knowledge and the destruction of ignorance. Posāla asks the Buddha about the state of knowledge of the person whose consciousness of form is extinct,

who has cast off corporeal form and perceives internal and external 'nothingness'. Mogharāja asks the Buddha how one should look upon the world so that Māra may not 'see' one. Piṅgiya like Jatukaṇṇi asks the Buddha to preach the *dhamma* in order to leave behind birth and decay.

A striking feature of many of the *pucchās* is the eagerness of the questioners to listen to the Buddha. Some of them come with special problems that had confronted them. Their earnestness is seen in *Sn.* 1061, 1097, 1120. Nanda's question gives the Buddha the opportunity of stressing the superiority of a moral life (cp. 1070c). He declares that speculative knowledge leads one nowhere. This is in contrast to contemporary Brahmanism where Upaniṣadic seers begin to emphasise the importance of knowledge (*jñāna*) for the attainment of Brahman. *Vijjā* (knowledge) in Buddhism in some aspects is allied to *jñāna*, yet the Buddha is seen consistently to reject metaphysical speculation (cp. *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*, etc.).

In reply to Upasīva's request the Buddha gives a short survey of the essence of *vimokkha*. This *pucchā* appears the most abstruse in the whole *vagga*. The concentrated ideas in it are highly philosophical and bear the tone of the more systematised passages of the *Aṅguttara* of similar import. It perhaps represents in germinal form the doctrines further dealt with in the *Aṅguttara* and *Saṃyutta Nikāyas* and carried to a degree of perfection in the later Abhidhamma Piṭaka.

The *ārammana* which Buddha gives Upasīva is based on *ākincañña* (cp. *na kiñcid anyat*). He has to cross the *ogha* by obtaining the release brought about by *saññāvimokkha* (cp. *saññāvedayitanirodha*). Then only does a *muni* 'go beyond reckoning' and obtain his release from *nāma* (*nāma-kāya*), for *rūpa* is eliminated at the stage of *ākincañña*. Here is a brief reference to the *kāya* theory of the *Nikāyas*. The *Poṭṭhapāda Sutta* in the *Dīgha* mentions the various *kāyas* as conceived by the divergent schools of animistic beliefs of the existence of a soul. The term *rūpakāya* occurs at S. III, 59 and *nāma-kāya* is that which corresponds to the entities designated as *nāma* in the division of the fivefold aggregates. Here is also to be seen a distant echo of the *kośa* theory of the *Upaniṣads*. There is nothing quite close to this in the *Nikāyas*, but the significant metaphor *asim kosiya pabbāheyya* (as one would draw the sword from the scabbard D. I, 77) seems to suggest an early connection of the same ideas.

The central ideas of the *pucchās* are discussed in the general remarks on the *Pārāyana Vagga* (PBR, 1, 3, p. 146). All the concepts in the *vagga* are doubtless very old. The passages of philosophical import do not show much growth. The occurrence of the terms *viññāṇa* (1055), 1073,



1110, 1111 and 1037, *nāmarūpa* (1036, 1100), *nāmakāya* (1074) and *nāma* and *rūpa* (1073), *ākiñcañña* (1070, 1071, 1072, 1115) has already been touched upon. The terms *kiñcana* (1098, 1099, 1104) and *akiñcana* (1059, 1091, 1094) are of no direct philosophical import. *Viññāta* (1086) in the phrase *diṭṭha-suta-muta-viññātesu* is a term common to passages dealing with sense-perception. The notion of going beyond *saṃkham* (1074), *pamāṇam* (1076), *kappam* (1101) agrees with the central theme of 'going beyond'. Like the *suttas* of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* the *pucchās* denounce disputation (*takka* 1084, *kathamkathā* 1088, 1089) and philosophical (speculative) dogmas (1078-1083, 1098). Many of the *mānavas* use epithets in praise of the Buddha (1043, 1049, 1063, 1069, 1073, 1090, 1101, 1105, 1112, etc.). He is called *samantacakkha* at 1063c, 1069c, 1073b, 1090d. The other frequent epithets are *aneja* (1112, 1101, 1043), *vedagu* (1049, 1059), *bhāvitatta* (1049) and *oghātiga* (1096). None of these epithets appears extravagant and all could be ascribed to an early period. The *dhamma* is spoken of as *anītiha* (not based on hearsay—1053). *Santi* is to be experienced in this world itself (1066). The terms *itihītiham* and *itthabhāva* also occur. No attempt is made here to discuss other data from the language of these *pucchās*, for both language and metre show signs of antiquity and agree in the main with the *suttas* of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*.

It is to be observed that only one (Puṇṇaka) out of these sixteen men asks a question about sacrifice, a thing which played a very prominent part in the lives of all the brahmins of the age. This question is the only justification to infer that Puṇṇaka was a brahmin; though in itself it is no conclusive proof. It has already been emphasised that some of the questions asked, definitely show that most of them have had a philosophical training in some system or other. It is quite probable that they may have belonged to some sects of *śramaṇas* or *ājīvakas* which cannot be easily identified on account of the scanty evidence at hand.

The only mention in the *Apadāna*, a considerably late work, of the celebrated Bāvari of the *Vatthugāthā*, with special reference to these *mānavas*, is made at *Ap.* II, 487 (Mogharāja), *Ap.* II, 342 (Mettagu) and *Ap.* II, 357 (Todeyya). It was stated earlier that the fact that some of the names are brahmin-names does not necessarily prove that the questioners were brahmins. Dhotaka in praising the Buddha calls him a *brāhmaṇa* and in the same stanza addresses him as *Sakya* (1063). At 1065 he calls him *brahme* (voc.). This presents no difficulty when the new significance attached to the word *brāhmaṇa* is taken into account (cp. *Dh. Brāhmaṇa Vagga*). The main purpose of these questions is to find out a solution to birth and decay and not the settlement of the differences between the theories of these interlocutors and Buddha's teaching, for none of them

comes to the Buddha as a disputant. All this evidence points to the lateness of the Bāvarī episode as compared with the *pucchās* and shows the absence of any justification for the late tradition that these *māṇavas* were brahmin-pupils.

### The Apadāna and the Sixteen Māṇavas

The only other source in which these *māṇavas* are mentioned in a manner worth noting is the *Apadāna*. Only eleven out of the sixteen are specifically mentioned, viz. Ajita: *Ap.* No. 397 (I, 335), Tissametteyya: No. 398 (II, 339), Puṇṇaka: No. 399 (II, 341), Mettagu: No. 400 (II, 342), Dhotaka: No. 401 (II, 343), Upasīva: No. 402 (II, 345), Nanda: No. 403 (*Ap.* II, 350), Hemaka: No. 404 (II, 351), Todeyya: No. 405 (II, 354), Jatukaṇṇi (ka): No. 406 (II, 357), and Mogharāja: Nos. 35, 537 (I, 87; II, 486). There is no trace whatsoever, in the *Apadāna*, of Kappa who should have been mentioned after No. 405, of Posāla or of Piṅgiya. There is the story of one Udena occurring in the *Apadāna* immediately after Jatukaṇṇika (i.e. No. 407. *Ap.* II, 362). Following this comes the *Apadāna* of Bhaddālī (No. 408. *Ap.* II, 365). Although the names appear somewhat similar the stories yield no clue for the identification of Udena with Udaya and Bhaddālī with Bhadrāvudha. Moreover, the order in which these two stories occur is the inverse of that of the two corresponding *pucchās*. Even in the case of the eight *Apadānas* in which there is no mention of Bāvarī (i.e. except Todeyya, Mettagu and Mogharāja) the text affords no positive evidence of a connection.

Further, Udena's *Apadāna* is the last number of the 41st (Metteyya) Vagga and Bhaddālī's opens the next chapter which is known by that name. This may be overlooked if there was any positive evidence of a connection, for Ajita's *Apadāna* ends the 40th (Pilinda) Vagga and therefore precedes the Tissametteyya *Apadāna*. The division of the *Apadāna* into *vaggas* being arbitrary and artificial, it is evident that *Ap.* Nos. 397-405 are meant to correspond to the nine *māṇavas* from Ajita to Todeyya. The tenth, Kappa is omitted, and the eleventh, Jatukaṇṇi occurs as No. 406. Then comes Mogharāja the fifteenth *māṇava* for whom there are two *Apadānas*. *Sn.* 1117 is quoted at *Ap.* No. 537, 25; and *Sn.* 1118-1119 at *Ap.* No. 537, 26-28. Though there are differences in details the two stories are practically the same. The fact that the Mogharāja *Apadāna* is so far away from the last story which has a bearing on the *māṇavas* (Jatukaṇṇi) hardly sheds any light on *Sn.* on account of the lateness of *Ap.*

### References in other works

From the nature of the questions and answers in the *pucchās* it is to be inferred that the *māṇavas* entered the Order. This is stated in the late



Epilogue (*Sn.* 1128). Yet it is rather disappointing to see that *Th1* is silent about most of them. It has already been shown that Ajita at *Th1*, 20 is not the same as Ajita of *Sn.* Similarly, Puṇṇa (*Th1*, 70), Nanda (*Th1*, 157-158), Posiya (*Th1*, 34) nor any one of the three Tissas in *Th1*. (39, 97, 153-154) shows any connection with the men bearing similar names in *Sn.* It is also highly improbable that Bhaddali (*Th1*, 275-277) or Bhadda (*Th1*, 473-479) and Udāyī (*Th1*, 689-704) have any connection with Bhadrāvudha and Udaya. The degree of improbability is less in the case of Kappa of *Th1*, 567-576, though no direct evidence is forthcoming.

On the other hand, it is quite probable that Mogharāja of *Th1*, 207-208 is the same as Mogharāja in *Sn.* In fact he is the most frequently mentioned person out of all these sixteen *mānavas*. It has already been stated that he is mentioned twice in the *Apadāna* (I, 87, II, 486) and once in the *Theragāthā* (*Th1*, 207-208). *Samyutta*, I, 23 contains two stanzas, one by Mogharāja and the other the Buddha's reply, which are not found either in *Sn.* or *Th1*. It may have been quite probable that the original *Mogharājapucchā* was longer than what is now handed down in *Sn.* It is also probable that the *Samyutta* quotes from another recension of the *Mogharājapucchā* which is now lost. The quotation found at *Milp*, 412 of a saying by Mogharāja cannot be traced either in *Sn.* or *Th1*. It is probable that the source from which it was taken was known to the author of *Milp.* and was subsequently lost. The nature of these passages does not permit the inference that they belonged to another Mogharāja. This corroborates what has already been noticed in the case of the two *Apadāna* stories.

It is not proposed to give an analysis of the linguistic data. The few remarks made earlier show to some extent the antiquity of these poems. All the evidence from external sources points to the fact that Mogharāja was a prominent member of the community. The evidence from the *Samyutta* and *Milp.* does not help to establish the anteriority of the poem in *Sn.* to those respective works. It is quite probable that *Sn.* preserves only a fragment of a longer dialogue; and that the *Samyutta* and *Sn.* are complementary to each other in this respect.

(to be concluded)

# A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE SUTTA NIPĀTA GENERAL OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

*N. A. Jayawickrama*

§1. In the series of contributions to the *PBR* concluding with the present article, an attempt has been made at an analysis of the Pāli Sutta Nipāta in the light of Higher Criticism. Various factors of the latter were grouped under the categories of 'criteria' which enabled us to estimate the single *suttas* as well as groups of them from the angle of literary, doctrinal and linguistic development. Special attention was paid, in the application of these criteria, to view the *Sutta Nipāta* under the aspect of historical development, illustrating its gradual growth. Wherever possible, external evidence was adduced in the historical interpretation of the data furnished by internal sources.

A study of methodology was one of the main concerns of this undertaking. Copious examples of each category have been given to illustrate and (as far as possible) prove the propositions; and special attention has been paid to samples of textual interpretation. Exegesis was both synthetic and analytic and the foundation on which it was built is the historical background of Indian (Hindu and Brahmanic) ideas around and prior to the time of Asoka.

By 'growth' is implied the gradual formation of a separate anthology called the *Sutta Nipāta* by the incorporation of *suttas* belonging to diverse strata.

For purposes of investigation this work has been divided into four parts. *Part I* (Introductory). The chief criteria (which fall under the heads of linguistic, metrical and literary evidence, doctrinal developments, growth of ideas and external and indirect evidence) employed in the examination of the ballads and other poems of the Sutta Nipāta were discussed in *PBR* 1, 2. The remarks (*ibid*) dealing with the title 'Sutta Nipāta' and its form and contents are also of an introductory nature, *Part II*. A brief study of the five *Vaggas* of the *Sutta Nipāta* was made in *PBR* 1, 3. Special attention has been paid to explain the present arrangement of the *suttas* in their respective *vaggas*. A few topics of general importance such as the seven *dharmapaliyāyas* of Asoka's Bhabra Edict, the Chinese version of the *Arthapadam* (*Aṭṭhaka Vagga*), the title 'Aṭṭhaka Vagga' and the relation of the *vatthugāthā* to the *pucchās* of the *Pārāyana* were also discussed there. *Part III*. The contributions in *PBR* 2, 1 to 3, 2 dealt with the analysis of a few *suttas*



representative of the various types of poems of the *Sutta Nipāta*, with the aid of the criteria detailed in *PBR* 1, 2. The poems examined were: three ballads from the *Uruga Vagga*, (*Uruga*, *Khaggavisāṇa* and *Muni Suttas*), five *suttas* of popular character (viz. *Parābhava*, *Vasala*, *Maṅgala*, *Metta* and *Ratana*), the Yakkha-ballads (*Hemavata*, *Ālavaka* and *Sūciloma Suttas*), the Pastoral-ballads, *Dhaniya* and *Kasibhāradvāja Suttas*, the narrative-ballads, *Pabbajjā Padhāna* and *Nālaka Suttas*, *suttas* from the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* and the *Pucchās* of the *Pārāyana*. Now, *Part IV* is devoted for general observations and conclusions.

The composition of the majority of these poems can be assigned to the period 400-300 B.C. On the evidence available, it is clear that individual *suttas* have to be taken on their own merits though to some extent particular types of *suttas* can be vaguely generalised as belonging to distinct strata. The results which this investigation points to fall under the following headings:—(1) an early nucleus of a more or less floating tradition; (2) several intermediate redactions incorporating *suttas* drawn from the Buddha-legend and Buddha-worship; (3) a final redaction made for the purpose of propagating the Buddhist faith through its ecclesiastic representative, the Saṅgha.

§2. In the analysis of the *suttas* (*loc. cit.*), with the aid of the criteria detailed in *PBR* 1, 2, a few general tendencies have been observed. Many of the poems, on linguistic grounds, appear to be old; but it is not always that the evidence from other sources is in support of this. Generally speaking the poems of the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana Vaggas* and many of the pieces of the *Uruga Vagga*, in addition to those poems which can be termed as the 'Muni-ballads', represent the oldest stratum in the *Sutta Nipāta*. Before finally enumerating the results which this investigation has led to, a short synthesis of the various data will perhaps be helpful in obtaining a better perspective of the *Sutta Nipāta* as viewed from the angle of Higher Criticism. This synthesis will be mainly devoted to some aspects of linguistic data; and the characteristics of the later compositions can be inferred thereby. No special attention will be paid to the nominal forms and the few remarks made in isolated instances on the vocabulary are deemed sufficient. Yet, some interesting nominal forms have been touched upon. On the other hand, a study of the verb and the verbal derivatives sheds further light on the *Sutta Nipāta* as a whole. However, dialectical variations, Vedic characteristics, style and metre will again be touched upon in passing. Sufficient has been said in the individual *suttas* taken up for analysis on the doctrinal developments; and comparisons with similar poems (in *Sn.*) and classes of ballads have to some extent shown the general trends in *Sn.* A short survey will be

made of the epithets and other terms used in *Sn.* to describe the *muni* and the Buddha.

§3. The *Sutta Nipāta* is rich in verbal forms and shows a very wide range. There are over 2,364 finite verbs in *Sn.* leaving aside variant readings and p.p.p's. used in a finite sense. Of special interest are the verbs in the Optative and Imperative Moods and the Aorist and Future Tenses.

*Optative.*—The most favoured inflexion for the opt. in *Sn.* is -e for 3 sg. In all, about 192 forms end in -e, but as many as 31 of them are either causals or medials (of the 10th class) with the element -ay- (i.e. -aye); e.g. *hāraye*; *ādiye*, *cintaye*, etc. A small number of these optatives in -e belongs to the first and second person singular; e.g. *sikkhe*, *Sn.* 1061a, 1062d, etc. Next in number come the forms in -eyya. Considering the fact that this is the most popular conjugational element for opt. in Pali, (*vide* Geiger, § 128) it is surprising to note that there are only 135 such forms. Geiger (*ibid.*) does not class these forms as very early, for -eyya is a generalization of the Sk. -eya which underwent universal application in Pali. Of the 135 forms, no less than 115 are 3 sg. Another inflexion used frequently is ā for 3rd sg. (Sk. -āt); 71 times. Its use however, is restricted to a few roots, e.g. √jñā, 33 times, √as, 27 times (*assa* and *siyā*), √kr (kayirā) 7 times, etc. The opt. 3 sg. in -etha occurs 57 times, and the 2 sg. in -etho only once (*Sn.* 833c). Opt. 1 sg. in -am occurs 6 times (*vijaññaṃ*, *Sn.* 482a, 1020d, 1022e, 1065b, 1090c, 1097d). The first pl. in -mu or -ma occurs 8 times (*jānemu*, *Sn.* 76d, 559f, 999ad, *jāniyāma* 873d, *namassemu* 995e, *sikkhema*, 89c and 32b v.l. *carema-se*). The 3rd pl. in -u or -um (// Sk. -uh) occurs 10 times. It is evident that these forms are old. As seen above, some of the forms ending in -um have also the element -eyy- which can be directly traced to Vedic (and Sk.) -ey. Besides those belonging to the type *kathayeyya* (*Sn.* 980d) which are accepted as old (Geiger § 139), the majority of the 135 forms in -eyy cannot be classed with the later types enumerated by Geiger (*ibid.*) viz. 1 sg. *manteyyaṃ* (*Sn.* p. 103), 2 sg. *āroceyyāsi* (M. II. 210), *dhāreyyāsi* (*Milp.* 47). 3 sg. *jāleyya* (M. II. 203) and *dasseyya* (*Milp.* 47).

*Imperative.*—The imp. in *Sn.* can be tabulated as follows:—

- 2 sg. in -a, 43; in -hi, 110; in -ssu, 23;
- 2 pl. in -tha, 40; in -vho, 3;
- 3 sg. in -tu, 16;
- 3 pl. in -ntu, 6.

All these forms are historical in varying degrees, but are used in all stages of the language, and therefore are of no great value.



*Aorist.—Parasmaipada:* Following Geiger's classification (Geiger, 159) 37 verbs can be said to belong to type I (33, aor. 3 sg., 3, aor. 2 sg., 1, aor. 3 pl.), 63 to type II (40, aor. 3 sg., 2, aor. 2 sg., 5, aor. 1 sg., 13, aor. 3 pl., 3, aor. 1 pl.), 90 to type III (72, aor. 3 sg., 5, aor. 2 sg., 3, aor. 1 sg., 10, aor. 3 pl.) and 119 to type IV (67, aor. 3 sg., 5, aor. 2 sg., 7, aor. 1 sg., 38, aor. 3 pl. 2, aor. 1 pl.,) which make a total of 309. *Ātmanepada:* There are 18 *A'pada* aor. forms. Of them 11 belong to type II (3 sg.), 4 to type II (1 sg.), 2 to type IV (3 sg.) and 1 to type IV (1 pl.)—*vide* Geiger, *ibid.* Among these forms are a few augmentless aorists. Some original pf. forms can still be distinguished, eg. *āha*, *vedi*, etc. The impf., lost in Pali, is represented by type II and the characteristics of the impf. are preserved in many of them.

*Future Tense.* The sign of the future tense conjugation *i-ssa-* and the terminations *-mi*, *-ma*, *-si*, *-tha*, *-ti*, *-nti* are used in 46 future tense verbs. A form with *issāmase* occurs once (*Sn.* 814d). The future 1. sg. *-issam* occurs 9 times, and *ssam* (without the connecting vowel, i) is used twice with thematic roots (*upessam*, *Sn.* 29c, and *sossam* 494c). The other historical forms are:—*anupadassati* (*dā-sya-ti*, *Sn.* 983b). *kāhasi* (*kār-sya-si*, *-ss-> -h-* 427d, 428d) *gañchisi* (*\*gam'sya- i/y*, 665d), *dakkhiti* (*drākṣyoti*, *i/y*, 909a), *dakkhinti* (p. 14), *pavakkhāmi* (*vakṣyāmi*, 701c, 963d, 1050b), *bhāsihi* (*bhōs-ya- i/y*, *analogical* 719a), *dakkhinti* (cp. *dakkhinti* 28c) and *sagghasi* (*√śak*. 834d). This brings a total of 72 future forms.

§4. The verbal derivatives too show an old phase of the language. The Agent Noun, Absolute, Present Participle, and the Future Passive Participle will be discussed below. The Past Participle Passive will not be touched upon as it yields no definite information. The Infinitives and other forms of Vedic or dialectical origin will also be mentioned.

*Agent Noun.*—There are 21 agent nouns in *Sn.* distributed in the following manner in the five *vaggas*:— 8, 1, 6, 4 and 2 respectively.

*Absolute (Gerund).*—There are 389 absolutes in the whole of *Sn.* *gāthās*. Of them as many as 187 end in *-ya*, i.e. 111 formed with vowel-ending roots in Pali, in addition to 2 with *-āya > ā* (*pariññā*, *Sn.* 779a, *palikhaññā* 968b), 66 with consonant-ending roots and assimilation, in addition to 3 with *-yy-* (*pappuyya*, *Sn.* 593b, 829d, 482d) and 7 forms with the *svarabhakti* vowel (*a-r-i*). Of these 187 forms, 185 contain prefixes conforming to the Sk. rules. The two forms without prefixes are:—*gahāya*, *Sn.* 791d, and *yāciya* 295b. Of the others, there are 117 formed with *-tvā*, directly from the root. There are 8 forms with *-tvā* assimilated (*labh+tvā > laddhā*). There are 26 forms formed directly from the base. Of the 48 forms with *-tvāna*, 45 are formed directly from the root, two

with the base and one form with assimilation (*laddhāna*, *Sn.* 67c). The form *daṭṭhu* occurs 3 times (*Sn.* 424b, 681d, 1098b). Of these 202 as many as 36 forms contain prefixes. It is clear that the majority of these forms go back to a very early stratum in the language.

*Present Participle.*—In all, there are 350 present participial forms. Of them as many as 139 are medial (107 contain the suffix *māna* and 32 *-āna*, both of which are highly archaic and go back to Vedic dialects). The occasional pronominal terminations of ppr. forms with *-māna* (e.g. *Sn.* 434a, and *mānassa*, 7 times) do not indicate that they were late, for in early Sk. too *-smin* and *-sya* are the terminations for the sg. of loc. and gen. respectively for ppr. medials in *-māna*. Of the rest of the 211 ppr. forms as many as 191 are historical. The total lack of forms like *gacchantassa* and *gacchantam* and the exclusive use of forms like *gacchato* and *gacchatam* for the gen. sg. and pl. respectively show that the ppr. too represents an old stage of the language. The 20 forms which cannot be considered equally old consist of 17 nom. singulars in *-anto* and 3 loc. singulars in *-ante*. But in Pali these endings came to be fixed for their respective cases rather early. Though they are not pure historical forms they may be old. The nom. sg. in *-am* occurs 83 times as contrasted with that in *-anto*, 17 times. The nom. sg. *-āno* occurs 21 times (passives included) while that in *-māno* (passives included) occurs 67 times. The nom. sg. neut. *-antam* occurs once (*Sn.* 208b *jāyantam*). The nom. pl. in *-antā* occurs 13 times, in *-mānā* 12 times, and in *-ānā* 9 times. The gen. sg. in *-ato* occurs 44 times as contrasted with that in *-antassa nil* and in *-mānassa* 7 times. The gen. pl. *-atam* is to be met with 20 times (*tām* once *metri causa*, *Sn.* 763d), as contrasted with *-antānam nil*, and *-mānānam* only once (*Sn.* 569c). The acc. sg. in *-antam* occurs 24 times (including passives and one instance of the final nasal omitted *metri causa* *-Sn.* 689c) as against the acc. sg. in *-mānam* 12 times and that in *-ānam* twice (*Sn.* 789d, 802c). The acc. pl. in *-ante* is to be seen three times, that in *-māne* twice and neut. *-mānāni* once. The inst. sg. in *-tā* occurs twice (*asatā*, *Sn.* 861b, 950c) and that in *-tyā* (fem.) once (*santya*, *Sn.* 872c). The loc. sg. in *-ante* and *-māne* occur three times each and in *mānamhi* once (*Sn.* 434a). The loc. pl. *-mānesu* is seen only once (*Sn.* 434c).

*Future Passive Participle.*—There are 63 f.p.p. forms in *Sn.*; of them 46 are formed with *-ya* (17 assimilated forms), 6 from *-tabba* and 11 from *-anīya*. A noteworthy feature is that 46 out of a total of 63 are formed with *-ya*. Speaking of Sk. the derivatives with *-ya* are formed in all periods of the language whereas the other two are of later origin—being almost entirely absent in the Vedas (Whitney § 962a). The same holds good with Pali.



The *infinitive* in *-tum* is the commonest, but there is an appreciable number of Vedic forms in *-tave*. (Dative Infinitive); e.g. *unnametave* (Sn. 206b), *dātave* (Sn. 286d), *vippahātave* (Sn. 817d) and *sampayātave* (Sn. 843d).

### Vedic and Dialectical Variations

§ 5. It is not only in the verb that Vedic and dialectical forms are preserved in Sn. Nominal themes too, both in their composition and declensional terminations show Vedic and dialectical characteristics. Many examples of such forms have been noted in the analysis of the *suttas*. To give a few more instances, the indicative 3 pl. (*A'pada*) in-*re* is seen to occur several times (*vide* Geiger, § 122. 2), e.g. *upadissare* (Sn. 140d), *dissare* (688d), *paṭijānare* (601b), *pithiyyare* (1034d, 1035d), *miyyare* (575b), *vijjare* (20a), and *socare* (445d). There are a few instances of the ending *-āmase* (1 pl.), e.g. *carāmase* (Sn. 32b), *sikkhissāmase* (814d). The Vedic *-as* has already been noted in *jaras* (Sn. 804d, 1123b), also cp. *lūkhasā* (Sn. 244a) and *damasā*, besides forms like *manasā* which are in frequent use in Pali.

There are at least 22 *double Vedic forms* in Sn.: of them as many as 17 belong to the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana Vaggas*; viz. *cutāse* (Sn. 774d), *avīta-taṇhāse* (776d, 901d), *sitāse* (791a), *paṭicchitāse* (803b), *pañhavīmamsakāse* (827b), *paṇḍitāse* (875d, 876b), *pavādiyāse* (885b), *upaṭṭhitāse* (898b), *saṅkhatadhammāse* (1038a), *samaṇabrāhmaṇāse* (1079a-1082a), *anāsavāse* (1082f, 1083f)—in the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana Vaggas*—and *samūhatāse* (Sn. 14b, 369b), *paccayāse* (15b), *upāsakāse* (367d), *samuppilavāso* (670d); also cp. the sg. *rakkhitamānasāno* (63b).

Dialectical variations are too numerous to give a comprehensive list here. The Māgadhī nom. sg. has been noted earlier. Besides this, various other forms belonging to dialectical strata have been pointed out. However, the following words are of special interest not only for the study of the *Sutta Nipāta*, but of the whole Canon. The *Sutta Nipāta* preserves many forms the parallels of which are to be found either in Sn. itself or elsewhere in the Canon. The word *akalya* occurs at Sn. 692a, (*akalya-rūpo*, 691b) besides *akalla* at 456d; but in the case of *tulya* 377c, 85b, 683b there is no parallel form *tulla* in Sn. (cp. J. IV, 102), whereas *tuliya* occurs frequently in the Canon (s.v. P.T.S.). Such combinations of semi-vowels do not present a standard form in Pali (*vide* Geiger, § 54). cp. also *-annaya* (Sn. 243c) and *-anvaya* (Sn. 36b, 254a, 556b). The forms *aggi*, *aggini* and *gini* have been noted earlier. The form *aggi* occurs at least 8 times in Sn. in addition to the proper name *Aggikabhāradvāja*;

*aggini*, 3 times (*Sn.* 668d, 670bd) and *gini* twice (*Sn.* 18c, 19c). The parallel observed (*loc. cit.*) was *atta*, *ātuma*, and *tuma*; *atta* occurs at least 45 times leaving aside cpds., *ātuma*, 3 times (*Sn.* 782d, 888b, 918d), and *tuma* twice (*Sn.* 890b, 908c). Substitution of consonants is to be noted in *anītika* (3 times) by the side of *anītiha* (also 3 times). The parallel form *abhikkhaṇaṃ* to *abhiṇhaṃ* (7 times in *Sn.*) is not to be met with in *Sn.* cp. *tiṇha* 3 times, but *tikhīṇa* and *tikkha* do not occur; also cp. *timisa*, *Sn.* 669c. Similarly *aṅga* does not occur though *iṅgha* is found 5 times. The particle *iva* (usually after original *h*, *m*, or inorganic *r*, *m*, or in combination with *a+i>e*—*sse va* only—occurs 37 times, whereas *va* occurs 58 times (7 times after *-ā* 4 after *-ī* 3 after *-e*, 20 after *-o* and 24 after *-m*). But the later Pali form *viya* occurs only 5 times in the whole of *Sn.* The form *chamā* occurs at *Sn.* 401b, but *samā* the rarer form does not occur. Other parallel forms of interest are, *iha* at *Sn.* 460a (in *tasmāt iha*) as opposed to *idha*, over 90 times; *uju* and *ujum* once each as opposed to *ujju*—7 times; *ubho*, the original dual 8 times as against *ubhaya* 5 times; *eva* 61 times as opposed to *va* 23 times (mainly *metri causa*) while *yeva* is seen 4 times; *kasira* and *kiccha* both occur once each (*Sn.* 574c, 676a); *kukkuciya* occurs once (*Sn.* 972d) and *kukkucca* twice (*Sn.* 925b, 1106d); *agiha* occurs 4 times, *gihī* at least 6 times, *gaha* (cp. *Rajagaha*, 408a) in *gahaṭṭha*, 9 times, *geha* (*nissita*) at *Sn.* 280b and *ghara* 6 times; *taccha* occurs at *Sn.* 327d and 1096d, while *tathiya* at *Sn.* 883a and 368c; *tatra* occurs 4 times as opposed to *tattha* about 40 times; *tamanudo* is found at *Sn.* 1136a besides *tamonudo* at 1133a; *thiyo* at *Sn.* 796c has been noted earlier, and *itthi* occurs at *Sn.* 112a; *divya* occurs twice and *dibba* 4 times (cp. *kalyā*); *dhañña* is seen 4 times as against *dhāniya* twice; *usabha* occurs 5 times whereas *asabha* occurs thrice in cpds.; the form *nariyo* (3 times) is probably a metrical variation of *nāriyo* and *nāriṇ* occurs at *Sn.* 836b; *nahā-taka* is found at *Sn.* 646c whereas *nhā-* is seen at *Sn.* 518b, and 521d; *pāda* occurs 14 times (inclusive of cpds.) while *pada* 17 times (cp. *padā* and *pādā*); the form *bhiyyo* (11 times) is preferred to *-bhuyyas* (only once in prose); the forms *sacchi-* and *sakkhi-* have been discussed earlier; *Sakka* occurs 6 times, *Sakya* 10 times and *Sākiya*, twice; *sāmin* and *suvāmin* occur once each (*Sn.* 83b, 666b). The group *sav-* has been dealt with earlier.

§6. Sufficient has been said on the style of the *suttas* in general, as well as that of the individual *suttas* taken up for discussion in Part III. The general inference made earlier is that a more ornate and 'finished' style is an indication of lateness in composition. The table of alliteration and assonance in the *gāthās* given by Mr. Hare (*Woven Cadences*, pp. 220 ff.) and his list of *śleṣas* (*ibid.* pp. 218 ff.) clearly show that these poetic devices are employed most in the pieces which cannot be stated to be the oldest



sections of *Sn.* On the other hand, onomatopoeia is not restricted to any one type of composition, yet it is apparently less in the earlier ones. Metre has been dwelt on at length in *PBR* 1, 2. The excellent analysis of the metres of *Sn.* by Helmer Smith (*Sn.A.* pp. 637 ff.) is a useful guide for the interpretation of the metres of *Sn.*

The *doctrinal trends* point to the realization of *attha*; the overcoming of birth, of misery ('III'), and of notions of self (*mamāyita*); the ascetic life and the Way Beyond are all attendant on the realization of this *summum bonum*. A comprehensive study of this aspect of *Sn.* has been made by scholars and it is not proposed to discuss it any further. (*Vide* Chalmers, Fausböll, Ilare and Katre).

§7. The terms and epithets used in *Sn.* usually reflect an old phase. The following synthesis will be mainly restricted to the *gāthās*. The term *muni* is used 77 times in the *gāthās*. It is distributed in the five *vaggas* in the following manner; 26, 2, 17, 18 and 14. In 24 instances it is an epithet of the Buddha. It is significant that 8 of the 17 references in *Mahā Vagga* are to the Buddha, and a noteworthy feature is that the least references to *muni* are in the two *vaggas* which are not the oldest sections in *Sn.* (i.e. 2 in *Culla Vagga* and 9 excluding the 8 references to the Buddha in *Mahā Vagga*). Besides these, *mona* occurs at *Sn.* 718c, 723cd, *moneyya* at *Sn.* 484c, 698c, 700d, 701a, 716a and *monapatha* at *Sn.* 540c. *Bhikkhu* occurs 80 times in the *gāthās*, i.e. 22, 19, 15, 18 and 6 times respectively in the five *vaggas* in addition to over 15 times in the prose. Just as the term *muni* occurs a large number of times in *Muni Sutta* (18), *bhikkhu* is frequently used in the *Uraga*, *Tuvaṭṭaka* and *Sammāparibbajaniya Suttas* (17, 9, and 8 times respectively). The term *sāvaka* occurs only 12 times, and it is significant that it is not used in the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana Vaggas*. Besides, these references are to be found in *suttas* which cannot be called particularly old. Five of these references are in the *Dhammika Sutta*, in which *bhikkhu* occurs 8 times but *muni* not once. *Samana* occurs 31 times in the *gāthās*, and over 10 times in the prose (7, 1, 11, 8 and 4 respectively in the five *vaggas*). It is used in a wider sense than a Buddhist *samana* in at least 17 out of the 31 occurrences. In the combined phrase, *samaṇabrāhmaṇa* it occurs 7 times in verse and once in prose. It is again curious to note that the word occurs only once in the *Culla Vagga*. The word *brāhmaṇa* occurs 141 times in verse and 12 times in prose (12, 16, 82, 8 and 23 times respectively in the five *vaggas*). The extraordinarily large number of references in the *Mahā Vagga* is due to the fact that it deals mainly with brahmin interlocutors; and in the *Pārāyana*, the majority of the references are in the *vatthu-gāthā*. *Brahma* occurs 43 times in the *gāthās* and 7 times in prose; i.e. *brahma* (Sk. *brāhma*)



once, *Brahmā* 6 times, as an appellative (voc. *brahme*) 3 times, and the rest in cpds. including *brahma-cariyā* 19 times in *gāthā* and 9 other references connected with *brahma-cariyā* in both prose and verse. *Brahma loka* is mentioned 6 times. There are only 3 references in the *Uruga Vagga* and one in *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*. *Thera* occurs only twice, and both in prose (discussed earlier). The word *saṅgha* occurs only 7 times apart from the 8 references in *Ratana Sutta*. It refers to the *Saṅgha* (apart from *Ratana S.*) probably only at *Sn.* 569d, 1015b (*Pār.* v.g.) and p. 16 (prose). The term *Buddha* occurs 39 times in the *gāthās* (i.e. 10, 5, 14, 1 and 9 times respectively in the five *vaggas*). Of these the personal *Buddha* is referred to 7, 3, 5, 1 and 9 times respectively in the five *vaggas*. All the references in the first three *vaggas* go with other epithets while the 9 references in the *Pārāyana* are to be found in the v.g. and epilogue. *Bodhisatta* occurs only once in the late *vatthu-gāthā* of the *Nālaka Sutta*. *Sambodhi* occurs 5 times. *Sambuddha* occurs 3 times in *Uruga Vagga*, 7 times in the *Mahā Vagga* and 9 times in the v.g. and epilogue of the *Pārāyana*. *Bhagavā* occurs 54 times in the *gāthās* and over 20 times in the prose. It does not occur in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*. *Satthā* occurs 12 times in verse and *Sugato* 4 times while each epithet is used at least twice in prose. *Tathāgata* occurs 21 times in both prose and verse; but it does not occur in the *gāthās* of the *Uruga* and *Aṭṭhaka Vaggas*.

In all the above instances it is quite clear that the early emphasis is on the *muni* or the *bhikkhu* and not on the *saṅgha* or the 'perfect' disciple nor on the personality of the *Buddha*. These aspects are taken up by the later poems.

§8. Coming to a few terms of general interest *atta*, *dhamma*, *attha*, *saddhā*, *patha*, *magga*, *nibbāna* and *saṃsāra* (*bhava*, etc.) demand attention. The words *atta* (by itself and in cpds.) *ātuma* and *tuma* occur 105 times in the *gāthās* (i.e. 11, 14, 44, 29 and 7 times respectively in the five *vaggas*). *Anatta* has already been referred to. *Atta* meaning body or soul in the Brahmanic sense is found at *Sn.* 508b (*Māgha's* words), and 919a (a denial) and 800a (a doubtful context); *atta* (self) tending towards the Brahmanic concept is found at *Sn.* 514a and 709a; *attānaṃ*, the reflexive in objective case in 10 instances (and probably also at *Sn.* 709a). The possessive of the (pronominal) reflexive occurs in 13 instances, the reflexive agent *attanā* in 5 and the loc. of the reflexive *attani* in 3 instances and the ethic dative at *Sn.* 368a. All the three occurrences of *ātumānaṃ* appear to be reflexives (*Sn.* 782a, 888b, 918d). *Mamatta* (or *mamāyita*) occurs 12 times in the *gāthās*; 9 of these references are in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*. *Amama* also occurs 5 times. The word *dhamma* occurs 188 times in diverse meanings. *Attha* occurs 48 times in *Sn.* The significant references are



*Sn.* 190d, 453c, 326c, 324d, 176a, 219a, 191c, 323c, 37b, 126a, 159d, and 320b. *Saddhā* occurs 16 times, but there is not a single reference to it in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* and the *Pucchās*. The words *patha*, *magga* and *yāna* have been discussed earlier. *Nibbāna* by itself and in cpds. occurs 15 times in *Sn.* The references are equally distributed in the five *vaggas*. There are 5 references to *samsāra* in the *Mahā Vagga* and *bhava* occurs 23 times in the *gāthās* (i.e. 6, 2, 5, 8 and 2 times respectively in the five *vaggas*) in addition to *bhavābhavataṃ* at *Sn.* 6b, *itthabhāvaññathābhāvaṃ*, 3 instances, *vitathaṃ* 9b-13b and *vinābhāva* at 588c, and 805c.

### Conclusions

§9. As regards definite results which this investigation has yielded, one is confronted with various difficulties. Firstly, the diversity and disparity of the constituent parts of *Sn.* lead to contradictory data which result in conflicting conclusions. Secondly, the various religious elements which are not clearly separable rather tend to confuse the issue and are not helpful in any way in deciding the diverse strata these poems belong to. To give an example, the Buddha is referred to in many ways; Tathāgata, Gotama, Sakya and Buddha. Though these terms are interlinked there is an inherent subtle distinction as seen in phrases such as, Tathāgata-sāvaka, Gotama-sāsana, Samaṇa Gotama and Buddha-vacana. Thirdly, the archaic character of the language is sometimes very deceptive. It is not always that poems bearing an archaic stamp, linguistically, are genuinely old. This fact has been stressed before and instances of this nature have already been noted; (e.g. *Ratana Sutta*). The Pali of the *gāthās* represents the standard vehicle of poetic expression, the archaic colouring being the outcome of a close adherence to what may be termed as the *gāthā*-style. Yet, the Vedic elements in *Sn.*, as a rule, are generally confined to those sections to which an early date can be assigned on *collective data*. On the other hand, the late linguistic characteristics have yielded definite information. Finally, no definite and precise information can be gathered from the haphazard arrangement of the *suttas* in *Sn.*, for, no final decision can be made from the present state of *Sutta Nipāta* which contains *suttas* put together at various dates and presenting no uniformity whatsoever. The different traditions in Pali and BSk., show that the development of these *suttas* is many-sided with divergent roots both in contents and form.

§10. In spite of these limitations the diverse strata as regards compilation as opposed to those of composition are discernible to some extent in the light of the information gathered in the course of our investigation. It is not our aim to determine the dates of composition of every *sutta*.

The internal and external evidence of the *suttas* selected for analysis in Part III has shown that the *suttas* of the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga*, the *Pucchās* of the *Pārāyana* and the ballads in praise of the Muni-ideal (found chiefly in the *Uruga Vagga*) are about the oldest sections in *Sn*. The general didactic poems found scattered in the first three *vaggas* and usually named after a simile or metaphor represent a subsequent phase. To the same period can be assigned the two opening *suttas* of the *Mahā Vagga* dealing with the Buddha's early career, the older dialogues in the *Mahā Vagga*, the dialogue-ballads of the *Uruga Vagga* and the Yakkha-ballads. Four of the five *suttas* of popular character (i.e. excluding *Ratana*, *PBR* 2, 2), the *Cunda Sutta* and the *Kokāliya Suttas* appear to be a little younger but were definitely pre-Asokan. The *Ratana*, *Vijaya*, and *Dvayatānupassanā* were probably the youngest *suttas* in *Sn*. while the *vatthugāthās* (excepting those of the *Rāhula Sutta*) represent the latest compositions in *Sn*.

S. N. Katre in his *Early Buddhist Ballads and their Relation to the older Upanishadic Literature* assigns the period 500-300 B.C. to the ballads of *Sn*. From the data now available and the fact that due allowance should be made for the arising of Buddhistic literary activity among the adherents of Buddhism (for, the pieces in *Sn*. are decidedly literary compositions) the age of composition of the bulk of the poems may be narrowed down roughly to the period 400-300 B.C. This does not deny the possibility of a few ballads being anterior to the earliest limit of 400 B.C. Although it is not possible to estimate by what length of time the various classes of poems were separated it is evident that the earliest and the youngest poems show a great disparity as regards their respective ages of composition. On the evidence available it is clear that individual *suttas* have to be taken on their own merits, though to some extent particular types of *suttas* have been vaguely generalised as belonging to distinct strata.

§11. This disparity in the dates of composition of respective *suttas* clearly implies a 'growth'. The stages by which the present anthology has come into existence underlie the various strata in *Sn*. Firstly there appears to have been an early nucleus of a more or less floating material quite similar to the traditional Brahmanic knowledge of pre-Buddhistic and early Buddhistic times on which were based the subsequent *Dharma Śāstras* and the early didactic literature of the Hindus. It is not only in thought and ideology that these early ballads of the Buddhists bear kinship with early Brahmanic literature (*vide* Katre) but also in phraseology and literary modes, all of which reflect a common background. This is not confined to the so-called 'unsectarian' ballads of *Sn*. which deal with general Indian or 'Āryan' teachings (embracing the ethical principles o



Brahmanic teachings and Upaniṣadic lore) but is much in evidence even in poems which are considered as being distinctively Buddhistic.

The earliest attempt at a collection as such belongs to a subsequent period. Many of the poems in the *Aṭṭhaka Vagga* and the *Pucchās* of the *Pārāyana* are of a sectarian character on a broad basis. Although the general outlook of these poems is rather wide there is something characteristically Buddhist underlying them, as contrasted with poems of common Brahmanic and Buddhist origin. There is no doubt that the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana Vaggas* and the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* formed the foundation on which this collection of *suttas* was built. In doing so the compilers have drawn freely from a floating tradition.

The transitional stage (or stages) of the formation of a *nipāta* was (or were) marked by the incorporation of these *suttas* as well as many others deemed as being truly representative of the Buddha's teaching. No definite conclusions can be arrived at regarding these intermediate stages. The present arrangement of the *suttas* in the *Uraga Vagga* (with the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* occupying the third place in it) shows a certain amount of re-shuffling to furnish a more effective presentation of the *suttas*; for, *Uraga* with all the mysterious significance attached to it was probably considered as a suitable *sutta* to be placed at the head of the anthology.

As noted earlier (*PBR* 1, 3), the *Uraga Vagga* appears to be older than the next two *vaggas*. In view of the internal changes that have taken place in the various *vaggas* (*ibid.*) it is quite clear that the final redaction of *Sn.* has been preceded by several intermediate redactions (though they cannot be easily enumerated). The *Culla Vagga* and the *Mahā Vagga* have not come into their present form by any historical sequence. As suggested earlier (*loc. cit.*), the two *vaggas* (perhaps together with *Uraga*) probably replaced an older group (or *vagga*) which contained *suttas* of popular appeal. The final phase was marked by the prefixing of *Uraga*, *Ratana* and *Pabbajjā* (and *Padhāna*) *Suttas* to the three respective *vaggas* under the editorial hand of monastic redactors for the purpose of propagating the Dhamma.

§ 12. Thus, the results of this investigation can be briefly summarised under the two heads (a) tradition and (b) growth:—

Sets of *suttas* with reference to tradition:

1. Unsectarian:

- (a) General Indian, 'Āryan' or Brahmanic (Upaniṣadic) teachings;
- (b) The ascetic ideal.

## 2. Sectarian ('Buddhist'):

- (a) *Suttas* purporting the Buddhist point of view;
- (b) *Suttas* with special Buddhist interpretations of then-current themes, values and concepts;
- (c) Buddhist Dogmatics; and *suttas* representative of the ecclesiastical phase.

3. Popular Buddhism; *Suttas* of the Life of the Buddha, and legend.

The main trends of growth:

- 1. An early nucleus of more or less floating material.
- 2. Several intermediate redactions incorporating *suttas* of popular Buddhism, dialogues, Buddhist ethics, life of Buddha and Buddhist worship.
- 3. A final redaction made for the purpose of propagating the Buddhist faith through its ecclesiastic representative, the Saṅgha.

### Postscript

Prof. Jayawickrama had agreed to contribute a recapitulation of the salient features of his *Analysis* that would incorporate the findings of other scholars made during the last thirty years. Unfortunately, his sabbatical leave in the West will be largely spent in lecturing at Cambridge and at Carleton College, Minnesota. Moreover, he had been engaged in preparing a new edition of the *Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā* together with a translation of the *Papañcasūdanī* (the Commentary to the Majjhima Nikāya).

However, since very few students have specialised in this field the Editor feels that he can but draw the attention of readers to those translations and studies that have appeared subsequent to the acceptance of the author's dissertation by London University in 1947. In passing, however, it should be emphasised that the discussion on linguistic terminology and pre-monastic features by Fausböll (*A Collection of Discourses*) and Chalmers (*Buddha's Teachings*) was substantially incorporated into Prof. Jayawickrama's *Analysis*.

All the English translations, in whole or in part, of the *Sutta-Nipāta* are listed in the Editor's *Analysis of the Pali Canon* (BPS, Kandy 1975) and the two subsequent supplements. Straightforward descriptive surveys of this text as a whole are best found in M. Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature* II (University of Calcutta 1933; Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi 1972, pp. 92-98) and B.C. Law, *A History of Pali Literature* I (London 1933; Bhartiya Publishing House, Delhi 1974, pp. 232-260).



A chronological analysis of the component parts of this anthology has been performed by G. C. Pande in his unique *Studies in the Origins of Buddhism* (University of Allahabad 1957; Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1974, pp. 51-65). A similar survey was conducted by G. F. Allen in *The Buddha's Philosophy* (George Allen & Unwin, London 1959, pp. 73-82).

Outstanding exegetical works on specific sections are represented by P. D. Premasiri, *The Philosophy of the Aṭṭhakavagga* (BPS, 1972), and Nyāṇaponika Thera, *The Worn-Out Skin* (BPS, 1977)—which includes the text and translation of the *Uraga Sutta*.

In her study of asceticism from Pali canonical and commentarial literature, *The Paccekabuddha* (E. J. Brill, Leiden 1974), Dr. Ria Kloppenborg has included a translation of the *Khaggavisāṇa Sutta* together with its Commentary (pp. 79-125).

Finally, in order to present what is hoped to prove an illuminating comparison with the Pali text, studies of and translations from the Sanskrit and Chinese recensions, together with related materials, are planned for eventual publication in the *Review*.

*Editor*